

Luise Abramowski

New Christological studies

Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities

Texts and studies on the history of early Christian literature (TU)



Archive for the edition of the Greek Christian writers of
the first centuries

Established by
O. von Gebhardt and A. von Harnack

Published by Christoph
Markschies

Volume 187



Luise Abramowski

New Christological studies

Edited by Alexander Schilling Edited by

Volker Henning Drecoll,
Hanns Christof Brennecke and Christoph Marksches

DE GRUYTER

Published by the
Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities
by Christoph Marksches

ISBN 978-3-11-064492-0
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-064741-9
ISSN 0082-3589

Library of Congress Control Number: 2019930903 Bibliographic

Information of the German National Library

The German National Library lists this publication in the German National Bibliography; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2021 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Typesetting: Dörlemann Satz, Lemförde
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Hanns Christof Brennecke, Volker Henning Drecoll,
Christoph Marksches

Foreword

Luise Abramowski, a world-renowned specialist in the history of dogma and theology in Christian antiquity, and in particular the Antiochian tradition, Nestorius and the Church of the East, died in Tübingen on 3 November 2014 after a long illness. The slim volume "Drei christologische Untersuchungen"¹ already demonstrated not only the author's interest in the history of dogma, but also her independence with regard to gnosis research and the reconstruction of Christological discussions. In conversations with Luise Abramowski at her bedside, the question arose as to what might become of her unfinished edition of the Syriac fragments of Theodor of Mopsuestia's *De incarnatione* in the manuscript British Library add. 12.156 could become. This gave rise to the idea of combining the academic commemoration of the Protestant Theological Faculty in Tübingen - where she, born in East Prussia in 1928 and raised in Riga, was appointed in 1974 after her time as a seminar assistant in Bonn and the influence of the Reformation historian Ernst Bizer, whom she greatly admired, and where she taught until 1995 - with the presentation of an anthology of contributions by this special researcher.² This volume was to publish the aforementioned edition of the Theodore fragments as well as a series of other essays that were not included in the volume of essays "Formula and Context"³ published in 1992. Luise Abramowski's preferred genre was the essay, whereby she published both short comments on specific problems on a few pages and also submitted long manuscripts, often revised and supplemented with marginalia, which presented the typesetter (or even the assistants) with particular challenges. When selecting the essays for the new and concluding anthology, the editors - the successor to Ms. Abramowski and her two assistants - were therefore keen to complete the aforementioned edition of the Theodore fragments and to compile closely related studies, but also to include essays on Christology, especially on Babai the Great, but also on Syriac church history and the church

¹ L. Abramowski, *Drei christologische Untersuchungen* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 45), Berlin 1981.

² For her own view of her academic career, see L. Abramowski, *Dogmen- geschichte und Literarkritik*, in: D. Meyer (ed.): *Kirchengeschichte als Autobiographie. Ein Blick in die Werkstatt zeitgenössischer Kirchenhistoriker*, vol. 2 (Schriften des Vereins für Rheinische Kirchengeschichte 154), Cologne 2002, 1-15.

³ L. Abramowski, *Formula and Context. Studies in Early Christian Thought*, Variorum Collected Studies Series, Hampshire/Brookfield 1992.

of the East and the history of dogma in the fourth and fifth centuries. The basis for the selection was the list of her publications in the commemorative publication dedicated to her under the title "Logos", which was then supplemented in the special issue of the "Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum" dedicated to her⁴.

The aforementioned memorial act of the Tübingen Protestant Faculty for Luise Abramowski took place on January 23, 2019. The academic memorial lecture entitled "The beginnings of Antiochian theology" was given by Hanns Christof Brennecke following words from the faculty and from the circle of students. By this time, Alexander Markus Schilling, who had himself been influenced by Luise Abramowski and whom she could imagine as an editor, had digitized the essays and processed the complex collection of Theodoric fragments. Nevertheless, the volume could not be published in the year of the academic commemoration, as originally planned, but has only now been completed, indexed and brought to print. The essays were largely left as they were in the first edition, with the specific characteristics and thus also in line with the respective state of research and in the formalities of the original place of publication. Only in the edition of the Theodore fragments have references been added to the edition of the fragments of Leontius of Byzantium by Brian E. Daley and the practical compilation of the Greek and Latin Theodore fragments by Till Jansen, which has since been published.⁵ Other references (for example to essays that have since appeared and were unpublished at the time) have been placed in square brackets. The aim was to avoid the view of this unique teacher's research being clouded by ἀλμυράι ἐπιρροαί⁶. The names familiar to the author were also largely retained for the entries in the index.

Special thanks are due to the original editor, Mr. Alexander Markus Schilling, who scanned, checked and prepared the articles for printing. He also compiled the synopses for the edition of the Theodoric fragments, which were missing or only sketched by Luise Abramowski by hand. We would also like to thank Dr. Nestor Kavvadas and Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. for their comments. There- sia Hainthaler. Volker Henning Drecoll is responsible for the final state of the text. For the

⁴ C. Marksches, Bibliography Luise Abramowski, in: H. C. Brennecke/E. L. Grasmück/C. Marksches (eds.): Logos. Festschrift für Luise Abramowski zum 8. Juli 1993 (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 67), Berlin 1993, 619-632; Bibliography Luise Abramowski, Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum 12 (2008) 5-9.

⁵ B. E. Daley, Leontius of Byzantium. Complete Works. Edited and Translated, with an Introduction (Oxford Early Christian Texts), Oxford 2017; T. Jansen, Theodor von Mopsuestia, De incarnatione. Überlieferung und Christologie der griechischen und lateinischen Fragmente einschließlich Textausgabe (Patristische Texte und Studien 65), Berlin 2009, 210-291.

⁶ Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus, De vita sua 1707 (Gregory of Nazianzus, De vita sua. Introduction, text, translation, commentary. Ed., introduced and explained by C. Jungck [Scientific commentaries on Greek and Latin writers], Heidelberg 1974, 136).

We would like to thank the Gertrud-und-Alexander-Böhlig Foundation for a substantial grant that made the project financially possible. We would also like to thank the publisher de Gruyter, in particular Dr. Albrecht Döhnert, for the friendly interest that the publisher has also shown posthumously for its author and its special commitment to this difficult manuscript.

During the preparation of this anthology, the editors once again became aware of Luise Abramowski's working style, which always sought its own path, as well as the fact that she often took for granted what was difficult for others, less initiated, to find out. Very detailed quotations, comprehensive references and long lists of secondary literature in extensive footnotes were downright repugnant to her. She consciously cultivated this economical academic style throughout her life and also recommended it to the next generation of academics: "If you have nothing new to say, you shouldn't publish anything," she advised one of her newly habilitated students at the start of his independent academic career. Textbooks were therefore not her thing. Today's academia usually works differently. However, Luise Abramowski's ability to develop and pursue overarching theses from individual observations on the text is still just as impressive as her ability to have cut paths and drawn lines, particularly in Syrian church history. This will also emerge clearly in her contributions, which are still to be published, in the large anthology "Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche" by Alois Grillmeier and Theresia Hainthaler. The editors hope that the present anthology brings together Luise Abramowski's research and makes it easily accessible, and that her studies will continue to have a stimulating effect in the future.

in November 2020

Hanns Christof Brennecke, Erlangen-Nuremberg
Volker Henning Drecoll, Tübingen
Christoph Marksches, Berlin

Christoph Marksches

Memorial speech for Luise Abramowski at the Academic Ceremony, Tübingen, January 23, 2019

"History of dogma and literary criticism" - with these words, Luise Abramowski titled an autobiographical article that was published shortly after the turn of the last millennium in an anthology of rather self-referential texts by contemporary church historians¹. The title "Dogmengeschichte und Literarkritik" (History of dogma and literary criticism) is apt and its author, as I can testify, has repeatedly considered using it as a title for publications, for example for her essays translated into English². The title "History of Dogma and Literary Criticism" is apt because it actually describes the specific nature of the Tübingen Ordinary, whose academic memory we have gathered to commemorate.

Even if the selection in the anthology "Kirchengeschichte als Autobiographie", in which "Dogmengeschichte und Literarkritik" was published, seems somewhat arbitrary, it is enough to mention the names of colleagues to recognize that in the combination of both approaches to the past lay a *point* (but of course only *a* point) of the work of my academic teacher in comparison to her peers and their teachers in the subject. Wilhelm Schneemelcher and Friedhelm Winkelmann publish in the same volume and represent the Berlin traditions of Hans Lietzmann, i.e. the traditions of a combination of text edition, detailed work on the history of dogma and more or less extensive narrative drafts³. Robert Stupperich gratefully mentions Karl Holl, another great Berlin church historian, who remains the guiding star of many Reformation historians to this day⁴. Luise Abramowski did not belong to any of these traditions. In the aforementioned article, she fails to mention who her surprising combination of a

¹ L. Abramowski, Dogmengeschichte und Literarkritik, in: D. Meyer (ed.): Kirchengeschichte als Autobiographie. Ein Blick in die Werkstatt zeitgenössischer Kirchenhistoriker, vol. 2 (Schriften des Vereins für Rheinische Kirchengeschichte 154), Cologne 2002, 1-15 - The Tübingen words for Luise Abramowski were merely supplemented by footnotes, the character of the oral speech was preserved.

² L. Abramowski, Formula and Context. Studies in Early Christian Thought, Variorum Collected Studies Series, Hampshire/Brookfield 1992.

³ W. Schneemelcher, Rückblicke, Erinnerungen und Betrachtungen, in: D. Meyer (ed.): Kirchengeschichte als Autobiographie. Ein Blick in die Werkstatt zeitgenössischer Kirchenhistoriker, vol. 2 (Schriften des Vereins für Rheinische Kirchengeschichte 154), Cologne 2002, 257-326 and Friedhelm Winkelmann, Als Kirchenhistoriker in der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften, in: *ibid.*, 367-406. ⁴ R. Stupperich, Mein Lebensweg von Moskau und vom Ural bis Westeuropa, in: D. Meyer (ed.): Kirchengeschichte als Autobiographie. Ein Blick in die Werkstatt zeitgenössischer Kirchenhistoriker, vol. 1 (Schriften des Vereins für Rheinische Kirchengeschichte 138), Cologne 1999, 371-396.

She laid the foundation for the approach of historical and systematic theology with a method of exegetical, above all German Old Testament scholarship as a teacher. Her autobiography begins, as was her sober, East Prussian way, with the sentence: "Born July 8, 1928 in East Prussia, school years in Riga, Lyck (East Prussia) and Potsdam. There she graduated from high school in 1946. "5 It could have been formulated in more detail and the first eighteen years of her life could have been described in more detail, at least in an autobiographical essay, and the two references to "East Prussia" stand out in the sparse list. Riga was also important to her and she occasionally talked about the poverty in the Reformed parsonage and her envy of the wealth of her father's Lutheran colleagues. On the occasion of her eightieth birthday, she exegeted a postcard she had bought from an antiquarian bookshop to the Latvian capital for the festive gathering in the dining room of the Tübingen Abbey instead of the academic lecture, following all the rules of the art⁶.

There is practically nothing to read about all this in the aforementioned article under the heading "History of dogma and literary criticism", "because I found it too boring for me". This is what Mrs. Abramowski wrote to me in her clear, fine handwriting on the offprint. She herself did not write down what she found boring, although it would have been extremely interesting for others. If you want to understand why literary criticism took precedence over dogmatic history from the very beginning of her studies in Bonn, you have to turn to the first page of the "History of Israel", which Martin Noth, professor of Old Testament studies in Bonn since 1945, published in 1950 with Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. "I would like to thank Miss Luise Abramowski in Bonn, the daughter of my friend Rudolf Abramowski, who was called away from his congregation and his academic work suddenly and all too soon for us in 1945, for her kind help in proofreading and preparing the indexes. "7 Called away? "Frozen to death miserably on the way to deportation to Soviet captivity" is how Luise Abramowski briefly described the terrible loss of her formative father, whose dissertation topic (originally given to him by Erich Seeberg) she took up and worked on in her Bonn dissertation, which she completed in 1955⁸. Martin Noth, with the help of the

⁵ Abramowski, *History of Dogma and Literary Criticism*, 1.

⁶ R. Abramowski/E. Cube, *Chronik der deutsch-reformierten Gemeinde in Riga*, published on behalf of the presbytery, Göttingen 1933.

⁷ M. Noth, *Geschichte Israels*, Göttingen 1950, 5th ed.

⁸ L. Abramowski, [Foreword to:] H. C. Brennecke, *Bibliographie Rudolf Abramowski*, in: H. C. Brennecke/E. L. Grasmück/C. Marksches (eds.): *Logos. Festschrift für Luise Abramowski zum 8. Juli 1993* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 67), Berlin 1993, 633 (Bibliography: 634-640). On the history of her dissertation topic: L. Abramowski, *Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius* (*Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 242 = *Subsidia* 22), Louvain 1963, 11 f.

As is well known, he developed his history of the transmission of the Pentateuch and formulated his hypothesis of a Deuteronomistic historical work using the method of literary criticism. One can see from one of Luise Abramowski's student friends, Rudolf Smend, how much such Old Testament inspiration from Bonn has also had an impact elsewhere up to the present day⁹. However, I do not want to talk in detail about this dissertation, which is the first evidence of the importance of literary criticism for the history of dogma and theology: The so-called *Liber Heraclidis* can be used as a source for the reconstruction of Nestorius' theology if and only if the complex process of growth of the text, which has come down to us today in a handful of Syriac manuscripts, is taken into account; many years ago, Alois Cardinal Grillmeier succinctly summarized Mrs. Abramowski's thorough research on the three stages of growth in two and a half pages¹⁰. As a student at Tübingen in the late 1980s, I encountered this form of combining the history of dogma and literary criticism not in the Syriac readings that Mrs. Abramowski held regularly until almost the turn of the millennium (there we read the *Didascalia apostolorum* in an edition that had just been published¹¹ and not the *Liber Heraclidis*), but in the lecture on the history of dogma, which was held for forty-five minutes each on four afternoons. Her essays grew out of the lectures, and these essays were brought back into the lectures in the mode of self-representation. Both in the lectures

"Dogmengeschichte I/1" as well as "Dogmengeschichte I/2 (Antike nach Chalzedon)" and also in the special course "Gnosis" one experienced her specific combination of "Dogmengeschichte und Literarkritik". A single example: in the heresiological compendium of the urban Roman theologian Hippolytus (allow me this simplistic characterization), Ms Abramowski had discovered a "Gnostic logos theologian" as the editor of a complex of sources¹², thus again highlighting three levels - Hippolytus, Gnostic special material and logos editor - of literary growth and using her little green stubby pencil in the German translation of Hippolytus to mark the relevant sections with the book-

⁹ R. Smend, Martin Noth (1902-1968), in: Critics and exegetes. Portraitskizzen zu vier Jahrhunderten alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft, Göttingen 2017, 825-846.

¹⁰ A. Cardinal Grillmeier, Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche. Vol. 1 Von der Apostolischen Zeit bis zum Konzil von Chalcedon (451), 2nd, improved edition, Freiburg et al. 1982, 708-710.

¹¹ The *Didascalia Apostolorum* in Syriac, Vol. I Chapters I-X, ed. by A. Vööbus (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 401 = Scriptorum Syri 175), Louvain 1979 and Vol. II Chapters XI-XXVI, ed. by A. Vööbus (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 407 = Scriptorum Syri 179). Vööbus (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 407 = Scriptorum Syri 179), Louvain 1979 - The hand copy, richly annotated by Mrs. Abramowski, which was used in this exercise of the summer semester 1986, is now in my possession.

¹² L. Abramowski, Ein gnostischer Logos theologe. Umfang und Redaktor des gnostischen Sonderguts in Hippolyts "Widerlegung der Häresien", in: this, Drei christologische Untersuchungen (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 45), Berlin/New York 1981, 18-62.

R" for editor and "T" for tradition; the unmarked rest was Hippolytus, according to her¹³.

Before I stylize my academic teacher as a church historian in the spirit of Martin Noth, I should at least add how much her Bonn academic teacher Ernst Bizer and his very specific view of the beginnings of the Reformation and the points of Martin Luther's theology influenced her work - she always enjoyed reading Luther's sermons and thus more indirectly expressed the problem of the identification of the Reformer's "main writings" by Karl Holl's school, time and again she also delved into the New Testament and the theological history of the Middle Ages, not always to the satisfaction of her colleagues.¹⁴ So many years after her death, it may perhaps also be added that, despite all her interest in Martin Luther, she was a sober Reformed Christian throughout her life, that she considered the Antiochian differentiation between the divine and human sides of Jesus Christ to be the more convincing form of Christological reflection, even in her presence, and that the Alexandrian tradition was rather more distant to her¹⁵. She was, as East Prussians were¹⁶, warmly devoted to people¹⁷, but could also be brusque and was vulnerable, especially to the disparagement that was shown to women in academia in the last century. She was only awarded the Tübingen professorship in 1974 (perhaps it can now be made public), contrary to her own expectations, because a prominent systematics expert from the faculty who was impressed by her erudition intervened with the responsible officer at the ministry in Stuttgart and the later Secretary General of the Stifterverband and Berlin Senator for Academic Affairs added her to the list of

13 It was about: St. Hippolytus of Rome's refutation of all heresies. Translated from the Greek by K. Graf Preysing (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, 1. R. 40) Munich 1922; available online at: <https://bkv.unifr.ch/works/116/versions/134/divisions/103673> (last accessed on 15.11.2020).

14 Corresponding references can be found in the two bibliographies: C. Marksches, Bibliographie Luise Abramowski, in: H. C. Brennecke/E. L. Grasmück/C. Marksches (eds.): Logos. Festschrift for Luise Abramowski zum 8. Juli 1993 (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 67), Berlin 1993, 619-632 sowie Bibliographie Luise Abramowski, Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum 12 (2008) 5-9.

15 This was particularly noticeable when I preached at her funeral on 14.11.2014 at the Tübingen hilltop cemetery, "when she took heart and, still very excited, climbed the pulpit of the Tübingen collegiate church to preach" in the academic service.

16 As she repeatedly and brusquely rejected the idea of being a "doctor's mother" and was always called "professor".

den, not "Professorin" (as she once told me, she wanted to take up the profession of her male colleagues and not an independent one in a female form), it would not have been right for her to add the female form "Ostpreußin" here.

17 She also supported female students in particular who had a child during their studies kind and generous.

high Tübingen faculty and did not appoint the *primo loco* colleague¹⁸. *Tempi passati*. Ms. Abramowski's retirement at the end of the 1994/1995 winter semester was also almost a quarter of a century ago.

Not everything that Luise Abramowski wanted to complete has been finished in view of her unstable health in the last years of her life - contributions to the work "Jesus the Christ in the Faith of the Church" edited by Theresia Hainthaler are still waiting to be published in the corresponding volumes. Among the preparatory materials that Mrs. Abramowski, as thorough as ever and completely averse to the hasty proliferation of writing, t a c k l e d was a manuscript of the Syriac fragments of a central work of Antiochian theology, the lost book *De incarnatione* by Theodore of Mopsuestia. I would like to briefly discuss this manuscript, its history and the contexts, because the contexts are highly characteristic of the author of the manuscript. It had been known for some time that Luise Abramowski was working on the Syriac transmission of *De incarnatione*. However, experts were somewhat surprised to learn that almost twenty years ago, a young doctoral student from Göttingen thought he could translate and re-edit the Greek and Latin fragments in their original language under the book title "Theodor von Mopsuestia, De Incarnatione"¹⁹. *Syriaca sunt, non leguntur*. There is not a single line written in Syriac in this book, which nevertheless deals with an ancient work that was still completely preserved in Syriac translation and considerable Syriac fragments until the catastrophes of the twentieth century.²⁰ In her lifetime, Luise Abramowski's preparatory work for the edition of the Syriac

¹⁸ This is what Manfred Erhardt, later Secretary General of the Donors' Association for the Promotion of Sciences and Humanities in Germany, who was then a consultant for the University of Tübingen in the Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs of Baden-Württemberg, told me verbally during an interview in Berlin in February 2006. Erhardt reaffirmed this view at a meeting in October 2019.

¹⁹ T. Jansen, Theodor von Mopsuestia, *De incarnatione*. Überlieferung und Christologie der griechischen und lateinischen Fragmente einschließlich Textausgabe (Patristische Texte und Studien 65), Berlin 2009 - In the preface, Luise Abramowski is thanked "for a very motivating conversation, further corrections and advice as well as her support in the publication of this study" (ibid., VII).

²⁰ My colleague Ekkehard Mühlenberg, the supervisor of the dissertation, pointed out to me in a conversation after the Tübingen ceremony in 2019 that the clarification of Stemmatian relationships through the work was a value in itself and that Ms. Abramowski was of the opinion that one could only study the Greek and Latin side of the tradition of Theodore's writing. Of course, I am not the only one to raise this critical objection: "Unfortunately, the author [sc. Jansen] does not seem to speak Syriac (or Armenian), so that he has to accept the research results of the grande dame of German syrology, Luise Abramowski, without checking them. In general, the absence of the Syriac tradition, both the monophysite and the diophysite, i s to be deplored most severely in the case of Theodorus" (P. Bruns, review by Till Jansen: Theodor von Mop- suestia, *De incarnatione*, *Sehepunkte* 11 (2011), no. 3 (<http://www.sehepunkte.de/2011/03/17540.html>; last accessed on 15.11.2020). S. Gerber expresses a very similar opinion in his review of the dissertation,

traditions and their translation. Only now can a new edition of the two series of Syriac fragments of the *De incarnatione* be added to the thoroughly meritorious new edition of the Greek and Latin tradition by Jansen and of the fragments in Leontius of Byzantium by Daley²¹. Ms. Abramowski originally came across this topic in the course of her preparatory work for the edition of the famous Syriac-Miaphysite manuscript Brit. Mus. Add. 12156 for the Löwen "Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium", additionally challenged by the task of critically examining a manuscript by the Roman Jesuit Raimund Köbert from the Roman Pontifical Biblical Institute²² with translations of the fragments for Cardinal Grillmeier's aforementioned work. Her handwritten preparatory work for a fundamental revision of Köbert's German translation was transferred into digital form for the first time in 1990 by the then assistant (Ms. Abramowski had not been granted a chair secretariat during the Tübingen negotiations)²³. Thanks to the help of the Gertrud-und-Alexander-Böhlig-Stiftung, thanks to the work of Alexander Markus Schilling, Volker Drecoll and Hanns Christof Brennecke, what I once wrote into the computer as an assistant has now grown into a veritable edition of Syriac text and German translation, including Greek and Latin parallels in the apparatus on over fifty pages. In view of the long publication period, one can only point out that good things take time and hope that the version presented here is more or less what Luise Abramowski had in mind during her lifetime.

The volume of Christological Investigations in which this expanded edition of Theodore's Syriac fragments appears is a sign of the lasting gratitude of Volker Drecoll, Hanns Christof Brennecke and myself to our highly esteemed academic teacher and predecessor, whose methodological rigor and rigorous scholarship we still occasionally feel under pressure, but whose attractive sides we are just as always aware of, in order to make her words about our own father more accessible to us.

in: Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum 15 (2011) 539-542. Further evidence for this assessment could be added.

²¹ B. E. Daley, Leontius of Byzantium. Complete Works. Edited and Translated, with an Introduction (Oxford Early Christian Texts), Oxford 2017.

²² W. R. Mayer, In memoriam: Fr. Raimund Köbert SJ (1903-1987), Orientalia. Nova Series 57 (1988) 212-217.

²³ In the "Editorial note by the editor" Alexander Markus Schilling (below, p. 37 f.), this version is designated as "Typoscript h)". The date "(1st manuscript stage, December 30, 1990)" was added by me at the time in contrast to the handwritten original and was intended to help distinguish the start of electronic recording from further digital editing stages. Until 1994, however, Ms. Abramowski only made handwritten additions to this printout, which she no longer had inserted into the electronic version of the file. The handwritten corrected printout (the typescript) therefore presumably reflects the state of her deliberations at this time.

slightly modified²⁴. "What do you know about Vööbus as an editor?" was the first question in the aforementioned Syriac exercise on the *Didascalia Apostolorum* to a handful of mid-semester students, who of course knew nothing, absolutely nothing, about the Estonian Protestant theologian, church historian and orientalist Arthur Vööbus and his achievements as an editor. Only at the end of the semester did the participants not only know a lot about a remarkable late antique church order, but also something about Vööbus as an editor²⁵. It is probably not only the three church historians mentioned above who are extremely grateful to Luise Abramowski to this day for such introductions, which from today's perspective are not very didactic but highly intensive and memorable. Many have reason to be permanently grateful to her.

Because it would not have been right to thank the *magistra* (as Ernst Ludwig Grasmück used to say) too much, I will conclude by illustrating these connections with an anecdote. When the beautiful lecture hall in the Tübingen Theologicum was about to be inaugurated, Mrs. Abramowski visited the almost completed room and inspected the lecture desk in particular. The proud architect was eagerly awaiting a friendly comment on the impressive octagonal building and its carefully and aesthetically designed details. The comment came, but it was quite different from what he had expected: "How can you," said Ms. Abramowski at the time, "just put such an impractical lectern here. It can't even be adjusted in height". She said something like that and the impractical lecture desk was promptly converted by the contrite architect. Since then, it can be adjusted in height - and after this story, even those who didn't know that will believe me that there are still many little-known good reasons to be grateful to Luise Abramowski, at least in Tübingen. The essays and editions presented in this collection are certainly among these little-known or completely unknown reasons.

²⁴ Abramowski, [Foreword to:] H. C. Brennecke, *Bibliographie Rudolf Abramowski*, 633.

²⁵ However, I am almost certain that Mrs. Abramowski did not tell us that Vööbus not only worked at the Estonian Faculty of Theology at the University of Tartu (hes., *The Department of Theology at the University of Tartu. Its Life and Work, Martyrdom and Annihilation [Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile. Scholarly Series 14]*, Stockholm 1963), but also at the "Luther Academy", an attempt largely determined by Erich Seeberg, the academic teacher of Rudolf Abramowski, to re-establish a German theological educational institution in the town (this university was founded in 1931 and closed in 1938; S. Bitter, *Umdeutung des Christentums. The Baltic theologian Erich Seeberg under National Socialism*, in: M. Garleff [ed:] *Deutsch-balten, Weimarer Republik und Drittes Reich*, vol. 1, 2nd, p. ed. ed., Cologne and others 2008, [267-296] 275-280). According to Vööbus in the first volume of his edition of the *Didaskalie* (p. 10*), the preparatory work for the edition dates back to the time he spent in his home country.

Table of contents

Foreword [?] V

Memorial speech for Luise Abramowski [?] VIII

1 Studies on the manuscript British Library add. 12156, in particular Theodor von Mopsuestia, De incarnatione

1.1 For the planned edition of Brit. Mus. add. 12156 [?] 3

1.2 The Anakephalaiosis to the Panarion of Epiphanius in the manuscript Brit Mus. Add. 12156 [?] 10

1.3 On the fragments of Theodor of Mopsuestia in Brit. Libr. add. 12.156 and the doubly transmitted Christological fragment [?] 22

1 Father Köbert's translation and his judgment of the famous fragment handed down twice [?] 22

2 How reliable is the tradition of Theodor's writings? [?] 23

3 Theodore's fragments in add. 12.156 [?] 27

1.4 The remains of the Syriac translation of Theodore of Mopsuestia, De Incarnatione, in Add. 14.669 [?] 29

1.5 Theodor of Mopsuestia [?] 37

Fragments from the manuscript add. 12156 of the British Museum, translated and explained [?] 37

[Editorial note by the editor] [?] 37

2 Babai the Great

2.1 The Christology of Babai the Great [?] 89

I. [?] 89

II. [?] 96

III. [?] 102

2.2 Babai the Great: Christological problems and their solutions [?] 111

I About the shape of the resurrection body [?] 111

II Hypostasis and Prosopon [?] 117

III Christ and the Holy Spirit [?] 130

IV	Discussion of basic Antiochian concepts [?] 139
V	Conclusion: Babai's basic religious attitude [?] 149

3 Further individual studies on Syrian church history (written after 1992)

3.1	The liturgical homily by Ps. Narses with the Mass confession and a quotation from Theodore [?] 153
3.2	On the writings of Michael Malpana / Badoqa [?] 166
3.3	Narsai, Ephrem and Cyril on Jesus' cry of abandonment Matth. 27,46 [?] 16
1	Narsai [?] 175
2	Ephräm and Narsai [?] 178
3	Abandonment and non-abandonment - distinction and unity in Christ [?] 183
4	Cyril of Alexandria [?] 185
3.4	"The stupor that interrupts prayer" Euagrius, Cent. Suppl. 30, in translation, original (?) and interpretation [?] 195
3.5	Martyrius-Sahdona and Dissent in the Church of the East [?] 208
3.6	The post-Ephesian Christology of the Edessen Theodorians [?] 220
3.7	The Bishop of Seleukia-Ktesiphon as Catholicos and Patriarch of the Church of the East [?] 228
1	"General bishop" - episkopos katholikos [?] 228
2	Patriarch [?] 234
3	Mar Aba [?] 243
3.1	Summary [?] 255
4	The minutes of the Synod of 424 [?] 256
5	The "correspondence of Katholikos Papa" and the special position of ep. VIII [?] 271

4 Older contributions to Syrian church history (written before 1992)

4.1 An unknown quotation from *Contra Eunomium* by Theodor of Mopsuestia 281

4.2 Ps. Nestorius and Philoxenus of Mabbug 288

4.3 Dadisho Qatraya and his Commentary on the Book of the Abbas Isaiah 293

- 1 The "filioque" in the procession of the Holy Spirit 294
- 2 Dadisho's protest against the multiplication of hymns in the life of the
solitaries 294
- 3 The solitaries and the meaning of scripture 296
- 4 Dadisho and the eskolayē 297
- 5 Theodore of Mopsuestia in Dadisho's commentary 299

5 Contributions to the history of dogma in the 4th-6th century

5.1 The third Arian discourse of Athanasius. Eusebians and Arians and the Western Serdicense 307

- 1 Kannengiesser's thesis 307
- 2 Ctr. Ar. III 59-67: against a formula of the Eusebians 310
- 3 Ctr. Ar. III 1-25 and the "western" Serdicense 313
- 4 Ursacius and Valens on the suffering of Logos and Spirit and the text of
the Serdicense 316
- 5 Athanasius and the hypostasis controversy 319
- 6 Ctr. Ar. III 26: A biblical argumentation of the Arians 325

5.2 What does the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum (C) have to do with the Council of Constantinople in 381? 331

- 1 The theological tomos from 381 331
- 2 A.-M. Ritter on the creation of C 335
- 3 Theodore as a nineteenth-century theologian after his catecheses 337
- 4 Theodor on the Nicaenum and its completion in the
III. article 340
- 5 The Epistles of Damasus and the subscription of the great Meletian Synod
in Cod. Veron. LX 341
- 6 A Roman note on the completion of the article on the Holy Spirit in
the Nicaenum 343

7	Theodor on the "ecumenical" synod [?] 345
8	Theodore's confession, the Roman formula and C. [?] 346
9	From Romano-Nicaenum to the "Confession of the 150 Fathers" in Chalcedon [?] 349
Appendix A: On the "Symbol of the Church of Antioch" (Hahn § 130, Denzinger/Schönmetzer no. 50) [?] 352	
Appendix B: The text of Theodor's symbol [?] 357	
5.3	The History of Research into Nestorius [?] 363
5.4	The councils' faith in Christ [?] 375
1	The four ecumenical councils [?] 375
2	Presentation of the Council texts [?] 376
3	The theological problem [?] 379
5.5	The Spirit as a "bond" between Father and Son - a theologoumenon of the Eusebians? [?] 399
5.6	The session of the Council of Ephesus on July 22, 431. "On the attachment of the symbol of the holy fathers of Nicaea and on the libellus handed over by the presbyter Charisius" " [?] 405
5.7	Nicenism and Gnosticism in the Rome of Bishop Liberius: the case of Marius Victorinus [?] 414
5.8	Concilium Ephesenum - 431 [?] 466
5.9	"Audi, ut dico". Literary observations and chronological considerations on Marius Victorinus and the "platonizing" Nag Hammadi treatises [?] 472
I	Marius Victorinus [?] 472
II	Barbelognostic [?] 481
III	Chronological problems [?] 481
of places of first publication [?] 49	
Bibliography [?] 499	
Sources [?] 509	
Bible [?] 520	
Names (persons and places) [?] 52	
Subject index [?] 531	

**1 Studies on the
manuscript British Library
add. 12156,
in particular Theodor von Mopsuestia,
De incarnatione**

1.1 For the planned edition of Brit. Mus. add. 12156

The author of this article has long been planning an edition of the famous Syriac Monophysite manuscript Brit. Mus. add. 12156 for the Löwen Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Contrary to earlier announcements, the edition will contain the entire manuscript, not just the particularly well-known part up to f. 91r. The entire manuscript deserves to be treated as a historical unit in the sense of Eduard Schwartz. As early as 1927, Schwartz himself expressed the wish for an edition of the entire text,¹ but obviously meant the main part up to f. 91r (the manuscript has 137 leaves). But an edition of f. 1-91 on a larger scale would only be what has often been done before: a partial edition.²

A schematization of the collection's contents will give us an idea of how it grew in layers until it reached its present form, whereby it is useful to free oneself from Wright's structure³. As usual, the beginning of the manuscript is destroyed; f. 1 begins in one of Timotheus Aelurus' florilegia.

- I Narratio Timothei f. 1r
- II Epistolae Timothei f. 29v
- III Solutio definitionis Chalcedonensis Timothei f. 39v
- IV Solutio tomi Leonis Timothei f. 42v
- V Timotheus de conversione dyophysitarum f. 61r
- VI Collectio epistularum f. 63r
- VII Florilegium Edessenum f. 69r
- VIII Blasphemiae Diodori, Theodori, Nestorii f. 80r
- IX Collectio epistularum f. 90r
- X Cyrilli apologia ad Andream f. 91r
- XI Cyrilli apologia ad Theodoretum f. 107v
- XII Gregorius Thaumaturgus ad Theopompum f. 122v
- XIII Epiphanius Anacephalaiosis f. 129v⁴.

¹ E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431, eine antichalkedonensische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos*, Abh. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil-hist. Kl. XXXII, 6, Munich 1927, 131.

² The most recent is: R. Y. Ebied-L. R. Wickham, *A collection of unpublished Syriac letters of Timothy Aelurus*, *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, N. S. 21, 1970, 321-369, where f. 29v-36v are reproduced and translated, with apparatus and introduction. - Since then another edition of Timothy [L. A. probably means

R. Y. Ebied-L. R. Wickham, *Timothy Aelurus: Against the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 18, 1985, 115-166, with an edition of No. III - *the editor*].

³ W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, acquired since the year 1838*, London 1870, 639-648.

⁴ Now L. Abramowski, *Die Anakephalaiosis zum Panarion des Epiphanius in der Handschrift Brit. Mus. add. 12156*, *Le Muséon* 96, 1983, 217-230 [here in this volume pp. 10-21].

[24] The group of Timothy writings (I-V)⁵ forms a historical unit. The epistle collection (VI + IX) appears to be separated by VII + VIII (Flor. Ed. and "blasphemies") were subsequently interrupted. Both groups of letters contain pieces from the time between the Ephesian councils, those in VI compromise Theodoret, and were therefore to be used in the three-chapter dispute, which does not mean, however, that they were only then compiled. The "blasphemies" of the most famous (or in our case: the most notorious) Antiochians are, by the way, compiled under observation of even proportions: each author provides a little over 30 quotations; Diodorus begins f. 80r, Theodore f. 83v, Nestorius f. 86v, and IX begins f. 90r.

The colophon f. 91r and the page headings of the manuscript attribute everything preceding it, i.e. I-IX, to Timothy; for the colophon of the entire manuscript (f. 137v), the content accordingly consists of four parts: Timothy, Cyril, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Epiphanius. In terms of the history of transmission, the colophon f. 91r means that the man to whom we owe the collection in its present size already found I-IX as a collection and was certainly guided by its lemma, which spoke of a work or the works of Timotheus Aelurus, without remembering the appendix VI-IX. This is probably again the intention of the compiler of I-IX, who added appendix VI-IX and was happy to let it run under the name of the Alexandrian. If the tendency of I-V is directed against the Chalcedonense and against extreme monophysitism⁶, Appendix VI-IX expands on this with its tendency against the Antiochians. At this point in the tradition, the geographical "seat in life" of the collection shifts: we are no longer in the patriarchate of Alexandria, but in the patriarchate of Antioch. The tendency of VI-IX also shows that X-XIII are not accidental additions, but are deliberately intended to supplement the material in I-IX: X and XI considerably reinforce the anti-antiochian accent once again, and thus correspond entirely to the intentions of VI-IX. Moreover, Cyril was the main authority for the direction represented by the entire collection. The writing of Gregory Thaumaturgus⁷ deals with the problem of whether God can suffer - the Theopaschite theme is known to run through the Christological disputes throughout their entire duration, so there is also a factual connection here. It can also be defined more concretely: a treatise of venerable origin on "the suffering of the incapable of suffering" (cf. the title of Crouzel's essay) was a desirable sub-ject.

⁵ Schwartz, op. cit. 126. 130, like F. Nau before him, drew attention to the fact that the writings of Timothy end f. 63 and not f. 91.

⁶ Cf. Schwartz, 129 and Ebied-Wickham, 327 f.

⁷ Recently examined by H. Crouzel, *La passion de l'impassible. Un essai apologétique et polémique du IIe siècle*, in: *L'homme devant dieu. Mélanges H. de Lubac I*, Paris 1963, 269-279; since then also by the author. [L. A. is probably thinking of her article 'Das Bekenntnis des Gregor Thaumaturgus bei Gregor von Nyssa und das Problem seiner Echtheit', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 87, 1976, 145-166 - *the editor*].

support for the advocates of the Theopaschite addition to the Trishagion, be it for a Petrus Fullo or a Philoxenus. I provisionally explain the appearance of Epiphanius (XIII) by the fact that it was placed at the end, so to speak, as a general anti-Heretican exclamation mark. XII and XIII have in common the function of the generally unquestioned authority of writers from the time before the [25] Nestorian disputes. Purely external points of reference for the addition of X-XIII are given by the fact that all three authors are quoted in one or more of the florileges of I-IX. Schematically, the growth of the collection looks like this:

A = I-V

B = VI+IX

c = VII+VIII

D = X-XIII

[A+B (+c)]+D = add. 12156

At what point in this development should we think of the intervention of the Syriac translation? Did A-D initially exist entirely in Greek? Schwartz⁸ is of the opinion that "the epitomizer of the Timotheos pieces can be identified with the not entirely unlearned man" who compiled the collection up to f. 91r (according to my count I-IX), and that this was in any case still done in Greek. This is confirmed by the fact that the excerpts from the letter of Andrew of Samosata to Rabbula of Edessa cannot come from the Syriac version of the complete letter⁹, as they have a different translation. The most common biblical key words on Christology are identical (although there are also some deviations), but both translators naturally had them in mind.¹⁰ Whether the further additions were made in Greek or Syriac still needs to be examined more closely.

Wright's remarks¹¹ on the palimpsest sheets of Brit. Mus. add. 17198 lay any relationship between these leaves and the manuscript add. 12156. He says of them: "The palimpsest portions of this volume¹² originally formed part of a manuscript written in three columns in a small elegant Estrangela of the VIth cent. The older text is now most distinctly legible on foll. 27 and 28. Judging by the running title" (sc. "Synode in Ephesus"), "arab. which is still visible on foll. 30a and 25b, at

⁸ Op. cit. 131.

⁹ After Vat. Borg. Syr. 82 and provided with an Italian translation by F. Pericoli-Ridolfini, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 28, 1953, 153-169.

¹⁰ What G. G. Blum, Rabbula von Edessa, CSCO 300 (Subs. 34), Leuven 1969, p. 155 note 15, means when he says: "It has not yet been noticed that the questions reproduced by Overbeck come from this letter", is not clear to me. For Pericoli-Ridolfini draws attention to Overbeck's edition from add. 12156 in his introduction, marks the excerpts in the Syriac text with square brackets and notes the textual differences at the end of the text. The fact of the different translations is not noted by him or by Blum.

¹¹ Op. cit. 503.

¹² f. 1-6 and 23-32.

the foot of the page, this manuscript contained, among other things, the Acts of one of the Councils of Ephesus. It also comprised the *Anakephalaieosis* of Epiphanius; at least there is written on foll. 24b and 29a, in slanting Greek uncials of later date, the same list of heretical sects, that we find appended to that work in Add. 12156,

f. 137a." Unfortunately, the old text, which has faded or disappeared, does not show up more clearly under the ultraviolet lamp¹³. I had hoped that this might be the remains of a parallel manuscript to add. 12156, but I was unable to identify the fragments of lemmata, colophons or page titles (the original rubrication has turned black and is therefore more legible than the text) with any [26] of those present in add. 12156. It is clear that these are Christological texts ("God Logos", "complete humanity", John 1, 14,

"person" etc.). F. 24r (the old text is upside down here, as is often the case) one can recognize the name of Nestorius, f. 31r the 12 anathemata of Cyril are mentioned. As far as I could make out, the *Anakephalaieosis* of Epiphanius does not precede the Greek list of heretics. In contrast to add. 12156, this list lacks the numbering with Greek letters, nor is it distributed in the same way on the textual level of the page.

The script of the old text of the palimpsest leaves of add. 17198 is smaller than that of 12156, but it can only be the same scribe, i.e. Talya of Edessa, because the typeface is so similar. In add. 12156 there is a kind of quotation mark > in front of each line to indicate non-rubricated quotations; such a series of several > on top of each other can be found in add. 17198 f. 4r.

For the addition of the destroyed beginning of add. 12156 from another manuscript, Ebied/Wickham¹⁴ refer to A. Moberg: "The manuscript" add. 12156 "is defective near the beginning; about five leaves, one leaf at the beginning and four leaves after fol. 8, are wanting. But the missing portions were discovered by A. Moberg¹⁵ in some fragments believed to contain the missing part of the manuscript." This statement is somewhat ambiguous: it is not the missing part of the manuscript, but of the text, and unfortunately not the lost half quire 2 (add. 12156 is placed in quaternions), but only a part of the lost beginning of quire 1. According to the quire count, two leaves must be missing at the beginning of add. 12156 must be missing two leaves and not just one, because the end of quire 1, counted in the inventory, is f. 6v, whereas it should be f. 8v if it is complete; of course it is not said that text was lost with the lost first leaf, as it may have been a flyleaf or title page. The fragments described and identified by Moberg come from a Serto manuscript of 932, which

¹³ I would like to thank the officials of the British Museum for their kind efforts.

¹⁴ Op. cit. 322.

¹⁵ A. Moberg, *On some fragments of the book of Timotheos Ailuros against the Synod of Chalcedon*, Lund 1928.

excerpted the Syrian Timotheus Aelurus. Here one would like to know whether the source for these excerpts offered the entire content of add. 12156 or only A-c.

As is so often the case with Syriac manuscripts, which derive their value from their *singularità* and thus from their content, hardly any direct text-critical work is possible. The individual editions, Lebon's analyses and, above all, Schwartz's fundamental work have done a great deal of preliminary work on the historical analysis of the parallel tradition and the identification of the many quotations. I am only summarizing here what has recently emerged in the course of my work on other subjects that is helpful for add. 12156. A. de Halleux deals with our manuscript in the introduction to his edition of Philoxenus' letter to the monks of Senun¹⁶. He can find parallels in three quotations from Philoxenus in the *Florilegium Edessenum* (= VII); although this is not a broad contact, one of the quotations in question is a quotation from Ps. basilius, which is otherwise unknown. In his following remarks, de Halleux then no longer means by "Florileg" only the *Flor. Edess.* but the entire content of the "Timothy" part of add. 12156, i.e.

f. 1-91r: this content offers not only patristic quotations, but also excerpts from Diodorus, Theodore, Theodoret, a historical account of the Council of the Robbers and a polemical section against Chalcedon and the *Tomus* of Leo. "Cette structure composite donne, croyons-nous, une bonne idée du document que l'évêque de Mabbog devait avoir à sa disposition en écrivant aux moines de Senoun". De Halleux thus obviously assumes that Philoxenus knew and used something similar to A-c.

In his posthumous book on the monk Marcian¹⁷, J. Lebon described the three Marcian quotations from the *Florilegium Edessenum* (nos. 69-71 in Rucker's edition¹⁸) and retranslated them.²⁰ Earlier²¹ he had already found excerpts from Athanasius' *Tomus ad Antiochenos* within the Marcian quotations: at the end of no. 70, *Tom. ad Ant.* 3 (PG 26, 800 A) is used, no. 71 consists entirely of Athanasius' text (*Tom.* 7, co1. 804 B-805 A, with an omission), except for one introductory line. I would add that the Syriac translation of Athanasius' text is not identical with the one that Brit. Mus. 8606 of the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* and which has been edited by R. W. Thomson in his *Athanasiana* II²². This is the case with the Greek

¹⁶ CSCO 232, Löwen 1963, XIII f.

¹⁷ J. Lebon, *Le moine saint Marcien. Étude critique des sources, édition de ses écrits*. Éd. A. van Roy (*Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense* 36), Louvain 1968.

¹⁸ I. Rucker, *Sitz.-Ber. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt.*, 1933, H. 5, 39-44.

¹⁹ Lebon, *op. cit.* 207-209.

²⁰ S. 256-258.

²¹ See p. 24 note 24.

²² CSCO 272. 273, Leuven 1967.

origin of the Flor. Edess. not to be expected otherwise. Lebon also²³ has two of the Epiphanius quotations, Flor. Edess. Nos. 50 and 51, as excerpts from ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίστις of Apollinaris (No. 50 = Lietzmann 178.8-14; No. 51 = Lietzmann 177.12-178.7; this information is not provided in the Marcian book).

Marcel Richard himself found the ending of quotation no. 14 of the Florilegium Edessenum (Methodes of Olympus, De resurrectione) in Greek. It is in a florileg of manuscript 86 (84) of the National Museum of Ochrida, from which Richard published some unknown texts.²⁴

Fortunately, the critical edition of the Acts of the Council of 553 is now available.²⁵ The Acts are known to have the following points of contact with our manuscript: 1) in the quotations from Diodorus and Theodore; 2) in the Tomus of Proclus to the Armenians; 3) in Rabbula's letter to Cyril. Here I give a list of the parallels according to the order in the volume of the Acts; for the Syriac side I will omit all the edition details here; they can be found in the apparatus of the Council Acts, whereas the places where they are found in our manuscript are not listed there.

[28]	ACO IV 1add	. 12156
	p. 55,6-10 Theodorf	. 83v
	p. 56,20-57,2 "Theodore "	f. 81v-82r Diodorus
	p. 5,4-13 Theodorf	. 85r

(this passage is a well-known crux of Theodore's interpretation, since another Syriac version shows considerable deviations in Christological terminology)

p. 61,12-14. 17-19 "Theodore "	f. 83v Diodorus
p. 74,5-7 "Theodore "	f. 83r Diodorus
p. 75,3 f. "Theodor "	f. 82v Diodorus
p. 75,20-30 (= 56,20-57,2) ²⁶ "Theodore "	f. 81v-82r Diodorus
p. 76,12 f. 17-19 (= 61,12-14. 17-19) "Theodorus "	f. 83v Diodorus
p. 85,11-22 Proclus ad Armeniosf	. 66r f.
p. 85,25-86,6 Proclus ad Armenios	f. 67r
p. 89,8-15 Rabbula ad Cyrillum	f. 91r

(add. 12156 offers, in contrast to the Acts, only one excerpt from this letter; interestingly, the Collectio Casinensis of the Ephesian Acts - ACO I 4, p. 212,23-30 - has exactly the same excerpt, in a different Latin translation than ACO IV 1; this is not unimportant for the origin of the collection of letters VI+IX in our manuscript).

p. 111,27-112,6 (= 85,11-22) Proclusf	. 66r f.
---------------------------------------	----------

²³ Op. cit. 23 note 21.

²⁴ M. Richard, Quelques nouveaux fragments des pères anténicéens et nicéens, Symbolae Osloenses 38, 1963, 76-83. Our quotation there p. 81.

²⁵ Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum IV 1, ed. J. Straub, Berlin 1971.

²⁶ The Latin versions of the pieces repeatedly quoted from the files are not completely identical.

As a document of moderate Monophysitism, the entire collection add. 12156 deserves the same editorial attention as the Severus and Philoxenus corpora.

1.2 The Anakephalaiosis to the Panarion of Epiphanius¹ in the manuscript Brit Mus. Add. 12156

The Syriac monophysite manuscript Add. 12156, written in the year 562, contains as the last part (f. 120 u22-136 u1) the Anakephalaiosis of the Panarion, i.e. the compilation of the table of contents that Epiphanius sent before each tomos of his work. Epiphanius divided the Panarion into three books and these again into a total of seven tomoi, volumes, as he himself informs us (Proömium, Holl I p. 156, 27-29 and 161,21 f.). The headings to the volumes are counted twice: both within the book and consecutively³. Epiphanius gives two purely list-like compilations of the 80 heresies dealt with in the proemium and also calls them anakephalaiosis and epigraphe (p. 161,19). These lists with some of the framework pieces of the proemium are at the beginning of the excerpt from the Panarion, which is known as the

"Anakephalaiosis" is known⁴. The excerpt "must have been written before 428, since Augustine used it for his writing *De haeresibus*"⁵. It was also included in the first complete edition of Epiphanius' writings⁶. As a "convenient handbook of heretical history", the Anakephalaiosis was "much more widely used than the original work."⁷

[218] Our Syriac codex is therefore also one of the users. But while the specific intention of the final redactor can be precisely determined for all parts of this famous collection (also for the treatise of the "great Gregory", which precedes Epiphanius), the function of the Epiphanius text seems to me to be more

¹ Epiphanius ed. Karl Holl (GCS 25. 31. 37, 1915-1933, cited as (Holl) I. II. III [The editor compared the second edition: Epiphanius I. Ancoratus and Panarion haer. 1-33. edited by Karl Holl †, second, expanded edition edited by Marc Bergemann and Christian-Friedrich Collatz [...] Partial volume I/2. Addenda & Corrigenda, GCS Neue Folge 10/2, Berlin 2013].

² The manuscript is written in three columns. I indicate the columns and also the lines

³ The result is:

I 1. 2. 3 (= 1. 2. 3)

II 1. 2 (= 4. 5)

III 1. 2 (= 6. 7).

The confusion is then complete when the page heading Holl II p. 213 states "Tom. 3" (of the continuous count) where "Tom 4" (= II 1) should be.

⁴ This independent Greek Anakephalaiosis is not included in Holl's edition, but appears in his apparatus to the texts from which it is compiled. According to Holl's apparatus, the Greek. Anakephalaiosis is used below when it differs from the text of the Panarion.

⁵ Altaner/Stuiber, *Patrology* § 80,2.

⁶ Holl III, p. X.

⁷ Karl Holl, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Epiphanius* (Texte und Untersuchungen 36,2) 1910, p. 98. Holl was highly contemptuous of the "inauthenticity" of the Anakephalaiosis (p. 95-98), by which he means that Epiphanius himself is not the excerptor.

to be a general one. Holl describes in the history of the Epiphanius editions of the In the 16th and 17th centuries, the "confessional competition" was the driving force, each side hoped "that the old heresy fighter" would "provide them with weapons against the heretics of their day" ⁸. The final editor also had such an intention; the heretics against whom the collection is directed are the representatives of the Chalcedonense (in the part that goes back to Timoteus Aelurus) and the Antiochians (in the additional parts); they are countered by the heretic controversialist kat'exochen at the end.

Add. 12156 is older than all surviving Greek Epiphanius manuscripts (the oldest of which is Vatic. Gr. 503 saec. IX), but it was not analyzed by Holl for his edition. The translation initially (up to and including the treatment of the Gnostics) still shows the impartiality of the older type of translation, which can render σάρξ by ܠܚܡ "body" and οὐσία by ܠܬܠܗ "nature" ⁹. This type of translation was still common in the Nestorian disputes, Evidence for this are the two Cyril treatises in our manuscript, whose textual evaluation Pusey dispensed with for his Cyril edition, because this "old" translation represents a translation ¹⁰. For the history of the collection Add. 12156, Pusey's judgment on the Cyril translation means that Cyril was not first translated for the collection, but that an existing translation was used. The same can be said for Epiphanius. The time of translation is thought to be the first half of the This of course increases the value of our manuscript as a textual witness.

The lemma of anakephalaiosis in Add. 12156 reads (f. 129 u2 f.): "Book of the blessed Epiphanius, Bishop of Cyprus, on the dissent [219] (ܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܦܝܢܐܝܐ) of the heresies which were in the body (ܠܚܡܐ) before the appearance of our Lord, and on those after the ascension; there are 80. But their names and the difference of their causes are as follows". This contains key words from Epiphanius' prooemium, including the ἔνσαρκος παρουσία of Christ from I p. 155,21, which is characteristically rendered as "appearance in the body" ¹¹. The "dissensus" is probably the σχίσματα of I p. 157,1; "which are 80. But their names and the difference of their causes are as follows" translated more or less exactly p. 157,1 f.:

⁸ Holl TU 36.2 p. 5.

⁹ F. 131 r3,3 ܠܚܡܐ Holl I p. 165,20 ἐκ τῆς ... οὐσίας. But f. 131 r3,4 ܠܬܠܗ for φύσιν I p. 165,21.

¹⁰ S. P. N. Cyrilli, archiepiscopi alexandrini epistulae tres oecumenicae, libri quinque contra Nestorium, XII capitum explanatio, XII capitum defensio utraque, scholia de incarnatione unigeniti ed. Ph. E. Pusey, Oxford 1875 (= volume VI of opera Cyrilli, which is only written on the cover). What we have in Add. 12156 is the XII capitum defensio utraque. - The remark on the age and freedom of the translation p. X. Pusey has made the important observation that the Syriac version has certain peculiarities in common with the Latin version of Marius Mercator.

¹¹ But I p. 157,21 ἔνσαρκος f. 130 r1,8 is translated as ܐܡܪܐ, as is f. 132 r2,22 for I p. 227,13.

εἰσιν ὀγδοήκοντα, ὧν αἱ ὀνομασίαι καὶ αἱ προφάσεις αὗται. The Syriac lemma summarizes to the utmost what the independent Greek anakephalaiosis quotes in full in its introductory remarks.

Epiphanius organized his double list of heresies in the proemium according to the following points of view: the first list first lists the 20 heresies *before* Christ and then (with a new count) the 60 after Christ; the second list organizes the heresies according to the seven volumes of the three books. As already mentioned, the Greek Anakephalaiosis contains both lists, whereas our Syriac text proceeds more economically: it only adopts the first list together with the connecting text on the appearance of Christ (the latter I p. 157,19-158,1) between the two groups of 20 and 60 heresies: f. 129 u3,6 - f. 130 r3,42 = I p. 157,2-159,13. There is a difference in the numbers: in the Proemium of the Panarion the ordinal numbers 1-20 and 1-60 are written out as words, the Greek Anakephalaiosis leaves the numbers out, but the Syriac version counts, firstly with letter numerals and secondly consecutively from 1-80 - it is thus closer to the Panarion.


f. 130 u is followed by a new lemma, which has the form of a page heading, as is usual in our manuscript at the end of each quire: "Brief enumeration of the diversity of the causes of heresies. First, however, the mothers of all heresies are five, from which the others sprang, but the first four are". From "But first..." onwards, this is a shortened translation of the introductory sentence of the table of contents of Volume 1, I p. 162,3-5.

Our manuscript precedes each heresy with a rubricated lemma, whereby the ordinal number is written out as a word, following the pattern: "The third heresy: Hellenism" (f. 130 u1,37 f.). The text then begins with the name of the heresy in question, as in Greek, [220] with the serial number appearing as a numeral in the margin. In the case of the Samaritans and Jews, the two Greek group headings (I p. 166,20 "The tribes of the Samaritans are four"; p. 167,3

"The heresies of the Jews are seven") are included in the Syriac lemmas, which in the first case results in: "The tribes of the Samaritans are four. But their first heresy, which is the tenth of the preceding count, are the Gorotheians" (f. 131 u1,21- 26). The lemma on the scribes (no. 14) is constructed in a very similar way (f. 131 u2,24-29).

In contrast to the independent Greek Anakephalaiosis, the Syriac Anakephalaiosis is not organized according to volumes of the Panarion.

At the end of the second volume of the Panarion, Epiphanius has a section which he overwrites: ἐνδμήα Χριστοῦ ἡ μία καὶ μόνη οὔσα τοῦ θεοῦ πίστις (I p. 227,10-233). The Greek Anakephalaiosis has adopted this passage in its entirety (except for the last four lines). The Syriac version, on the other hand, only brings a minimum from it, and this is added directly to the message without a characterizing lemma.

on the Herodians (no. 20). f. 132 r2,20-28  is I p. 227,12-15; f. 132 r2,28-31 appropriately repeats Epiphanius' remark that he wants to be brief I p. 233,9 f.; f. 132 r2,32-38 processes I p. 233,11 f.

The cuts here in the interlude and earlier in the proem are offset by a few additions. No. 62, the Sabellians, are acknowledged in the table of contents of volume 4 in two lines. The Greek Anakephalaiosis transposes some of these words; Hs. U of the Panarion adds a few words that refer to Marcell of Ankyra. But the Syriac version draws on the detailed account of the Sabellians in the Panarion:

f. 135 r 3 f.	Holl II p. 389, 7 f.
4-10	11-13 (line 11 shortened)
10 f.	16
12 f.	p. 390, 3 f.
13 f.	3 (abridged)
	14-164 f.
	16-255-15 (very strongly contracted)

A recourse to the complete representation of the Panarion also explains the difference between the Syriac text and the Greek in the last sentence of no. 70 (Audians). The

Adverb ܕܝܠܝܢܐ (f. 135 u1,17) refers to ἀποκρότως of III p. 234,9 (or ἀπόκροτον p. 234,16), [221] and the keyword τὸ κατ'εἰκόνα in Syriac becomes "after our image and likeness" of the biblical passage quoted in III p. 234,11.

No. 77 (Apollinarists) has an addition in Syriac from parts of the detailed description:

f. 136 r 3,1-6	Holl III p. 436,11 and 12
6-11	p. 448.33 and 449.1 f.

No. 49 (Pepucians): f. 134 r2,29 inserts the Priscillians before the Quintillians; this must have been prompted by a glance at the heading of the detailed description II p. 241,18.

It is difficult to assess the difference between the Syriac and Greek texts with regard to the fasting or rather non-fasting of the Aerians (No. 75). In the Greek it says (III p. 231,14 f.): νηστεύειν δὲ τετράδα (= Wednesday) καὶ προσάββατον (= Friday) καὶ τεσσαρακοστήν καὶ πάσχα κωλύει. In contrast, one reads f. 135 u3,23-27:

"But it is *proper* to fast on Wednesday, on the Sabbath (? ܟܠܝܬܐ) and on Friday, but he forbids the Quadragesimal and Paschal fasts". ܟܠܝܬܐ is a reading¹² for ܟܠܝܬܐ ܟܠܝܬܐ Sunday. Between Wednesday and Friday, Sunday is certainly in the wrong place. From the detailed communication of Epiphanius about the opinions of the

Aerius on fasting (III p. 335,11-28), we learn that the group had the ambition to fast on Sunday, but to eat on Wednesday and Friday. In many cases, however, fasting was voluntary on Wednesday. They eat at Easter. It looks to me as if Sunday, on which one should fast, and Wednesday, on which one can fast,

¹² Further errors within the Syriac tradition: f. 134 r2,36 ܟܠܝܬܐ for II p. 211,13 ἔρημον. The correct rendering would be ܟܠܝܬܐ. The incomprehensible ܟܠܝܬܐ f. 134 r3,19 for II must also be corrected p. 211,22 ἐμπέση. Now it says ܟܠܝܬܐ ܟܠܝܬܐ, which is obviously due to haplography of the ܟܠܝܬܐ from ܟܠܝܬܐ ܟܠܝܬܐ originated. - See also the following note.

have been transferred from the detailed description to the table of contents, but that the present confusion has remained due to textual corruption.

Note no. 48 on the Montanists and Taskodru- gites has also been added. But this casus differs from the cases discussed so far because the addition is not taken from the detailed text of Epiphanius. The addition concerns the Taskodrugites, for whom the Panarion II p. 239,11-16 offers an explanation of the name, but of which the Syriac makes no use. Instead, it says (f. 134 r2,15-25): "But the Taskodrugites also add them¹³ [222]

because of ܐܬܬܝܬܝܬܐ = δὲ) the error of their heresy, and this (is) that they enjoy food without restraint and have unutterable intercourse with women and (are) perpetrators of shamelessness, like the other heresies, in order to celebrate a feast". The

is the most general description of an orgiastic cult. Filastrius of Brescia (died around 397) says more specifically in his *Diversarum haereseon liber* to haer. 75 (p. 38,21 ff. Marx, quoted by Holl II in the apparatus to p. 239,11 ff.): "Alii sunt iterum Asco- drugitae in Galatia qui utrem inflantes ponunt et cooperiunt in sua ecclesia et circum- eunt eum insanientes potius et bacchantes sicut illi pagani Liberipatriani, insanis mentibus more gentilium furentes". Vague knowledge of this also seems to be contained in our Syriac remark. This remark proves to be a gloss due to its beginning with "they add" (better "he adds"). The δὲ and the bald infix at the end make it probable that the gloss was already in the Greek text on which the translation is based. (For two other glosses, which must be somewhat older, see below).

The colophon of the Syriac Anakephalaiosis (f. 136 r3 below - f. 136 u1 above) is identical with the lemma. It is curious that on the free page (f. 137r), which is opposite the colophon of the manuscript, the list of 80 heresies in Epiphanius appears in the shortest possible version in Greek script, counted in Greek letters. Wright judges in his description of 1215614: "evidently written at the same time as the rest of the manuscript". Perhaps this list was attached to the Syriac version used by the final editor and was therefore adopted. The list appears again in Greek in a Syriac manuscript in the British Museum, in Add. 17198. Wright writes about it¹⁵: "The palimp- sest portions of this volume¹⁶ originally formed part of a manuscript written in three columns in a small elegant Estrangela of the VIth cent. The older text is now most

disinctly legible on foll. 27 and 28. Judging by the running title ܡܕܢܚܐ ܕܐܝܬܐ ܡܕܢܚܐ, which is still visible on foll. 30a and 25b, at the foot of the page, this manuscript

¹³ f. 134 r2,17 ܐܬܬܝܬܝܬܐ. But the plural ܐ is to be drawn to the following ܐܬܬܝܬܝܬܐ. Hence: "But he (sc. Epiphanius) also adds the taskodru- gites and (indeed) because of..."

¹⁴ W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, acquired since the year 1838, London 1870, p. 648.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 503.

¹⁶ These are f. 1-6 and 23-32.

contained, among other things, the Acts of one of the Councils of Ephesus. It also comprised the Anakephalaiosis of Epiphanius; at least there is written on foll. 24b and 29a, in slanting Greek uncials of later date, the same list of heretical sects, that we find [223] appended to that work in Add. 12156, f. 137a". Unfortunately, I had to realize that the old faded or disappeared text did not show up more clearly under the ultraviolet lamp. My hope was that this might be the remains of a parallel manuscript to Add. 12156, but I was unable to identify the occasionally recognizable fragments of lemmata, colophons and page titles (the original rubrication has turned black and is therefore more legible than the text) with any of those present in 12156. It is clear that these are Christological texts ("God Logos", "complete humanity", John 1:14, "person" etc.). The name of Nestorius can be recognized in f. 24r (the old text is upside down here, as is often the case), and the anathemata of Cyril are mentioned in f. 31r. As far as I could make out, the Anakephalaiosis of Epiphanius *does not* precede the Greek list of heretics. In contrast to 12156, this list lacks the Greek numbering, nor is it distributed in the same way across the page. The Syriac script of the old text of the Palimpsest leaves is smaller than that of 12156, but the typeface is so similar that in my opinion it must be the scribe of 12156, i.e. Talya of Edessa. The relationship between the two manuscripts lies in the person of the scribe and the similarity of the subject matter; perhaps this prompted someone to paint the Greek list on the free space of the possibly eliminated leaves for practice purposes.

*

* *

The comparison of the Syriac Anakephalaiosis with the Greek form thus brings to light two extensive abridgements, but on the other hand additions from the detailed account, as well as a gloss of Greek origin. This means that we have before us an adaptation of the Anakephalaiosis. Abridgements and additions may have taken place at three points in time: a) still on the Greek text, b) for the Syriac translation, c) for inclusion in our collection of texts. The first reduction (the deletion of the second list of the proem) is so obvious that it is conceivable at any time. But the reduction of the "one and only faith" (see above p. 220 [here in this volume p. 12]) to almost nothing would not be expected from the Syriac collection, which nowhere shies away from extensive texts. This leaves us with the first and second possibilities.

Apart from the major abridgements, there are always small, insignificant abridgements that are difficult to attribute to a particular phase of translation. The situation is different with a type of surplus that clearly results from the fact of translation into another language. These include the cases where the Greek heretical terms adopted as foreign words are replaced with Syriac ones.

words, e.g.f. 134 r3,27 (to "Aloger"): "which are translated: without a word". The addition of ܐܠܘܡܐ, ܐܠܘܡܐ, etc. to the copula is also Syriac.¹⁷

It is very rare for Syriac to actually have a different reading of a vocabulary than the Greek text¹⁸. These are the following passages:

No. 16 (Sadducees) I p. 167,23 ἄγγελον reads f. 132 r1,5 in the plural, which seems to me to be the better text¹⁹. Otherwise, however, it is the other way around:

No. 35 (Kolorbasioi) II p. 1,12 ἐδίδαξεν reads f. 133 r3,23 ἔδειξεν. The Greek text is preferable.

No. 45 (Severiani) f. 134 r1,17 has the strange ܐܠܘܡܐ ܐܠܘܡܐ which only seems to be explained by a corruption of II p. 4,2 τέ τινος ἀρχόντων to τέ ἀσαρχόντων.

No. 75 (Pneumatomachen) III p. 231,7 κεκτίσθαι, whereas f. 135 u3,1 ܐܠܘܡܐ presupposes Greek κεκτῆσθαι. This can initially be seen as an improvement. But the Greek text has already been found difficult by the Greek anakephalaiosis and then again by Holl. Lines 6-8 read: (make the pneumato) κτιστὸν αὐτὸ (sc. the spirit) ὀριζόμενοι καὶ οὐκ ὄν ἐκ τῆς θεότητος, μᾶλλον δὲ καταχρηστικῶς δι' ἐνέργειαν κεκτίσθαι, ἀγιαστικὴν αὐτὸ δύναμιν φάσκοντες εἶναι μόνον.

The Greek anakephalaiosis facilitates δι' ἐνέργειαν to κατὰ ἰδίαν ἐνέργ. Holl asks whether one should read δι' ἐνεργείας. If the reading κεκτῆσθαι presupposed by the Syriac text is more than an itacism, it too is a relief. The whole colon μᾶλλον-κεκτίσθαι is difficult in terms of content: 1) it is not compatible [225] well with the next colon, 2) it is not at all easy to recognize what καταχρηστικῶς is supposed to refer to, 3) one obviously could not do anything with δι' ἐνέργειαν. Much is gained if the colon is translated correctly: "but rather inauthentically because of being created as power"²⁰ (and not "for the sake of power", as Holl apparently understood and therefore corrected). As the sentence stands, "inauthentic" must refer to the preceding "and not being from God". This statement therefore receives a restrictive explanation, because

¹⁷ Even small paraphrasing expansions such as (I only give examples) f. 132 r1,17 ܐܠܘܡܐ, f. 135 r2,31 ܐܠܘܡܐ, f. 135 r3,1 ܐܠܘܡܐ are certainly due to the translation. One can waver at f. 131 u3,35 ܐܠܘܡܐ (καὶ τύχην), which has no equivalent in Greek. I p. 167,19 f. is γένεσιν καὶ εἰμαρμένην, so the τύχη can flow into your pen by itself, whether you write Greek or Syriac.

¹⁸ The translation f. 130 u2,5 f. of I p. 163,4 θέσμους is based on a different sentence division. εἰδῶλων μέντοι - Syriac read the period after εἰδῶλων, which is wrong. Incorrect sentence division also f. 131 r1,15 and 18, where the Syriac lemma no. 4 intervenes. I p. 164,15 f. τοῦ Ἀβραάμ θεοσεβεῖα <δ> καὶ μετέπειτα - the Syriac puts the period after μετέπειτα (and then brings its lemma no. 4); it thus confirms the original absence of the ordinal number added by Holl.

¹⁹ The detailed description I p. 208,2 also has the plural.

²⁰ I.e. the accusative of δι' is the infinitive; ἐνέργειαν is the subject of acc.c.inf. and not the accusative object of δι'.

as a power created by God, the Spirit comes from God in a certain way. However, since this is immediately followed by a colon about the Spirit as a "merely sanctifying power", which again devalues what has just been positively evaluated, only one of the two subordinate clauses can be original²¹. With μάλλον δέ, a gloss can very well be introduced; διά-sentences with acc.c.inf. are, however, entirely in the style of Epiphanius²², but compare the gloss above, which is only preserved in Syriac and also adheres to this style.

With the case just discussed, we have arrived at the textual difficulties of Epiphanius, as indicated and repeatedly improved by Holl. It will turn out that the Syriac Anakephalaiosis had already read the same text and sometimes had trouble coming to terms with it.

1) Holl I p. 163,5 misses a noun for οἷς, the Syriac did not find such a noun.

2) p. 163,8 Holl adds a participial apposition that Syriac does not have.

3) p. 164,6 the same (the participle proposed by Holl is κεκλημένοι; the Syriac occasionally inserts ܡܬܬܠܡܝܢ- but not here).

4) p. 234.9 the same.

5) II p. 1,4, Holl considers the text not only to be in need of supplementation, but also to have been inherited: he thinks that the error lies in the participle πορφύρεον μεταβάλων. But the Syrian already read this text.

6) From the translation (f. 133 r3,6-11) one can see that the Syriac did not understand II p. 1,6-8 correctly. There is no doubt, however, that [226] he read the extant Greek text. This reads: καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ τῶν εἴκοσι τεσσάρων στοιχείων βούλεται τὰ πάντα ἡγεῖσθαι ὁμοίως Οὐαλεντίνῳ. Holl puts the corruption mark before ἡγεῖσθαι. Syriac simplifies "he wants" to "he says", turns the genitive into of the 24 principles with the help of ܕܝܠܝܢ instrumentalis and understands the verb challenged by Holl in its meaning "to lead", caused by the medial form, passively ("the universe is led by the 24 principles"). However, ἡγέομαι can be used with can be constructed with the genitive case; in the meaning "to make a beginning", "to begin", what or with what one begins can be in the genitive case. Translated, this results in: "And he wants the universe to have its beginning in the 24 principles, similar to Valentin" (Valentin had 30). Even so, the sentence remains very hard, because ἡγέομαι + gen. actually means "beginning with an activity or the like" (λόγου καὶ ἔργου e.g.) according to the examples in the lexicon. Lampe, PGL, s.v. quotes our sentence not from Epiphanius, but from Johannes Damascenus, where it appears in exactly the same construction, and gives it the special meaning (3.) "come from" without any further evidence.

²¹ This is also supported by the fact that the word ἐνέργεια takes no account of the fact that Epiphanius designates the same thing with δύναμις. There is no Aristotelian difference between ἐνέργεια and δύναμις at this point!

²² Compare, for example, the section on the Angelics in the detailed account II p. 379,12-21.

Adjective and noun in the same genus. According to this, the reading of the Greek self. Anakephalaiosis would be the most correct; if one translates ψέγοντες ... ἐπισκόπους πλουσίους καὶ ἄλλους ἄλλους, this gives: "by rebuking [229] the bishops ... as rich and as otherwise still others"; in good German this would be: "and as otherwise still others", i.e. exactly ἄλλους ἄλλους. Is such a Greek construction impossible? Or impossible for Epiphanius? If one considers his use of ἡγέομαι

c. genit. and from ψέγω with double accusative (which was either unfamiliar to the Greek anakephalaiosis or not subtle enough, see above). Anakephalaiosis was either unfamiliar or not refined enough (see above).

15) f. 136 r1,36 f. ܐܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܝܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܝܢ confirms Dindorf's conjecture διὰ τοιούτων τρόπων Holl III p. 232,6 f. (διὰ τοιούτων J; διὰ τρόπον Anak.). On the other hand, Holl's two additions p. 232,7 and 9 are supported by the Syriac is not confirmed. However, the translation inserts the copula ܐܬܝܬܝܢ in the second place.

*

* *

In determining the relationship of the Syriac Anakephalaiosis to the Panarion and to the independent Greek Anakephalaiosis, it must be borne in mind that in the case of a difference between the two Greek text forms, the translation tends to go with the manuscripts or the manuscript of the Panarion, but by no means always; in the case of minor deviations, the reverse is precisely the case. This can be seen in detail in the edition of Add. 1215624. The conclusion to be drawn from the history of transmission is that the Anakephalaiosis, as an extract from the Panarion, has two independent forms of development, the Greek and the Syriac translation. The [230] editing to which the excerpts were subjected is of such a different nature that Add.

24 For example, the first Syriac page of the table of contents of vol. 1, f. 130 u.

f. 130 u1,33 ܐܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܝܢܝܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܝܢ= προσεκρίθησαν (to assimilate), as the Hss. of Pan. I p. 162,15; whereas Anakeph. reads προσεκλίθησαν (to incline).

f. 130 u1,40 ܐܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܝܢܝܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܝܢ= ἀπὸ τῶν χρόνων like the Hss. of Pan. I p. 163,1; Anakeph.: πρὸ ἑξ χρόνων.

But: f. 130 u2,19 ܐܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܝܢܝܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܝܢ= ἄξιον like Anakeph.; whereas Pan. I p. 163, 8 reads δοκοῦν.

I p. 164,4 has Holl καὶ τῇ χῶρᾳ τῇ παρεχομένου from the Anakeph. in the text; as in the Hss. of Pan. it is also missing in the Syr. f. 130 u3,17 f. Apparently this is an explanatory addition in the independent Greek Anakeph. Anakeph., just as the Syriac in turn has such in other places - in our case two lines further on to ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλαίας I p. 164,5: this is transferred to ἐλαίας I p. 164,5.

sets under transliteration of ἐλαίας f. 130 u3,19 f. ܐܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܝܢܝܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܝܢ, and this in turn is explained line 20 f.

ܐܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܝܢܝܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܝܢ. We can therefore expect more textual development of the independent Greek Anakeph. than Holl has estimated. I p. 164,7 the Hss. of Pan. and the Syriac ὅτε αἱ γλῶσσαι διεμερίσθησαν τῶν πάντων, which is missing in the Anakeph.; the same applies to line 8 πάντες.

12156 can offer evidence for the great age of certain readings of Epiphanius, despite further editing by the translation, which speaks for the originality of these readings despite Holl's justified stylistic sensitivity (which the textual witnesses repeatedly share).

1.3 On the fragments of Theodor of Mopsuestia in Brit. Libr. add. 12.156 and the doubly transmitted Christological fragment¹

1 Father Köbert's translation and his judgment on the famous fragment that has been handed down twice

Shortly before his death (Sept. 27, 1987), Father Köbert from the Istituto Biblico in Rome sent Father Grillmeier in Frankfurt a manuscript containing a German translation of the Theodore fragments from add. 12.156 and a short introduction. At the end of the introduction there is a date: March 3, 1985; I assume that Köbert completed his work on this day. Born in 1903, he was 82 years old. After a few general remarks, his introduction deals only with the famous case where another Syriac manuscript transmits a form of the text in which the expression "a hypostasis" is used for the one Christ, while add. 12.156 was content with the normal term "a prosopon". It is known that Marcel Richard considered the version of add. 14.669 as a rendering of the authentic text of Theodore; he therefore regarded the translation in add. 12.156 as evidence of an alteration of the original with hostile intent. Richard's view has been included in the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* II, where Maurice Geerard, under no. 3856, distinguishes between fragments of the *traditio genuina* (add. 14.669 and Facundus of Hermiane) and the *traditio alterata* of De incarnatione. The fragments from add.

12,156 naturally appear in the second group.

But Köbert reverses this relationship in his unpublished essay: in his opinion, the version of add. 14.669 is the work of an Edessener who was inclined to agree with the Synod of Chalcedon and therefore changed the terminology accordingly.

Fr. Grillmeier considered publishing Köbert's work in an appendix to Volume II 2 of "Jesus the Christ in the Faith of the Church" because Köbert had rightly pointed out that there is no German translation [2] of the fragments. In any case, a complete translation would be desirable, because Sachau's translation is difficult to access², incomplete and changes the order of the fragments.

¹ Presented in English as a communication at the 1990 Syrian conference in Kottayam, Kerala (India); the English version was published in the journal "The Harp" of the St. Ephrem Ecumenical Institute, Kottayam (vol. VI, No. 3, 1993, p. 199-206). - I have added some notes for the German version.

² The University Library in Tübingen does not own a copy. Compare this with the enviable situation a good hundred years ago, described by H. B. Swete, *Theodori episcopi Mopsuesteni in epistolas b. Pauli commentarii*, 1882, vol. II, p. 289 n. 2: "as these books" (sc. de Lagarde and Sachau) "are inexpensive and can easily be procured, I have contented myself with an occasional reference to them".

last fragments, which form a small appendix to the excerpts from *De incarnatione*. Before publication, Father Grillmeier decided to consult someone familiar with the specific problems, had Köbert's handwritten text typed and sent it to me. I voted for separate publication because for bibliographical purposes the translation in Grillmeier's volume would have been lost. Assuming that only some technical work on the introduction and a check of the translation would be necessary, I was prepared to take on the publication. Instead, I found that the translation had to be redone, that there was no reference to Sullivan's earlier criticism of Richard's thesis, and that the whole apparatus of parallel traditions, where they exist, still had to be prepared. All this took much more time than was originally estimated, and the work is not yet complete³. But I will say now that I am in complete agreement with Köbert as to the page on which the famous text is to be found in its authentic, albeit translated, form: in add. 12.156; the version of add. 14.669 is an adaptation of the passage in question. Grillmeier, of course, immediately saw the consequence of Köbert's judgment: the evaluation of the fragments from *De incarnatione* in the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* would have to be reversed (the excerpts in *Facundus* are, of course, to be excluded). This brings us to our next section:

2 How reliable is the tradition of Theodor's writings?

With regard to the transmission of Theodore's works, the following distinctions must actually be made: a) Friendly transmission and transmission by opponents, whether of the Greek original or the translations into Latin and Syriac. [3] It is characteristic of the opposing tradition that it makes a one-sided selection, i.e. excerpts are chosen which are intended to damage the orthodoxy of the author, so that a skewed picture of his views emerges. There are cases where the fragments are cut out of context in such a way that theses which the author opposes appear to be his own (as occasionally in the *Testimonia* for the Council of 553 and therefore reproduced by Pope Vigilius). The collection of Theodore in add. 12.156 is the most one-sided of all. There is an excerpt for which a broad Greek context is preserved in Leontius,

The *Analecta Syriaca*, Leipzig 1858, by Paul de Lagarde has been reprinted once (Osnabrück 1967). The work by Eduard Sachau, *Theodori Mopsuesteni fragmenta syriaca*, Leipzig 1869, contains i. a. edition and Latin translation of the mentioned fragments of add. 14.669, as well as a Latin translation of what de Lagarde reprints from Theodore's add. 12.156.

³ In the meantime I have also translated the remains of *De incarnatione* in add. 14.669 [for everything preserved in the estate see here in this volume pp. 37-85 - *the ed.*]; I must confess that they do not make a good impression literarily and as a translation.

himself a hostile tradent, we can see from him that the original text was framed by sentences about the unity of the nature of the one Christ - sentences that were deliberately omitted from the Syriac excerpt. - Fragments of the friendly tradition are those in Facundus, which go back to the (lost) Apology of Theodore for Diodorus and Theodore.

b) A second distinction applies only to translations. It is the distinction between slavishly literal translation and linguistically more readable transmission. In his book of 1956, Sullivan had to state again and again that the Latin fragments of the opposing tradition slavishly follow the Greek text wherever one has the possibility of comparison. The result of my observations on our collection is exactly the same. This is not always a help when translating, on the contrary. Theodore is sometimes difficult to understand and the Syriac translation even more difficult to read, perhaps not having understood the original properly either⁴. There are still places where the translation into German doesn't quite work for me. On the other hand, there are cases where one can guess the underlying Greek expression and thus find the correct meaning, or one can at least perceive that the Syriac translated a wrong meaning of several possible meanings of a word, and thus find the correct sense of the text.

The two different types of translation cannot be the result of coincidence, but seem to have to do with the function of the translated text. The cases of overly literal translations are certainly not the result of the translator's incompetence (although errors in the choice of synonyms or misunderstanding of the text naturally indicate shortcomings), nor do they⁵ represent a phase in the development of Syriac translation technique, since the phenomenon also occurs in the Latin tradition. I regard it as a matter of the literary genus, or more precisely of a theological literary genus^[4]: fragments translated in this way are testimonia, proof texts in the dogmatic debate, which are supposed to obtain their evidential force precisely through literal accuracy. For comparison, one would have to consult the Syriac translations of the Catechetical Homilies, the Commentary on St. John and De incarnatione in add. 14.669. These are not translations of excerpts, but of entire writings, even if only parts of the manuscript of De incarnatione have survived. One would assume that these works were translated because they were to be read or taught in one's own community. This does not exclude the possibility that the translator of De incarnatione in add. 14.669 wishes Theodore to be read in a particular dogmatic interpretation, and certainly from an apologetic-theological point of view.

⁴ It is useful to recall that the collection of Theodore's excerpts in add. 12.156 was already available to the translator as a *Greek* compilation.

⁵ It would be better to say "not only".

logical and/or ecclesiastical interest. Translations with a positively doctrinal, instructive or edifying aim must be readable and must not cause the user to stumble over terribly hard, unsyriacal constructions; this would greatly restrict access to something that is considered valuable. But if, in the light of such assumptions, we look again at the Syriac of add. 14.669 (namely in the attempt to translate it), then we find that the Syriac translation follows the (no longer existing) Greek only too literally, as can be seen from the clumsy syntax. This makes the famous Christological passage with its deviating version all the more conspicuous as a deliberate attempt to correct the content. We can compare this case with two much shorter passages, where add. 14.669 and 12.156 translate the same Greek text in more or less the same way. Thus De incarnatione in the versions of add. 14.669 becomes a special case that does not fit into either of the two established categories⁶.

Richard gave the fragments from De incarnatione in add. 12.156; the famous fragment has the number 16 (the two others with parallels in add. 14.669 have the numbers 19 and 20). In his article, Richard *did not* deal with the smaller group of excerpts that follow the texts from De incarnatione in 12.156. I have now continued his counting into this appendix. No. 32 is a quotation from the Catechetical Homilies; in the manuscript that Tonneau, the second editor of the Homilies, printed photostatically, it corresponds to 7 lines (f.15u). Although the passage [5] is so short, something critical can even be said about it: some words in the right-hand margin of the manuscript are slightly blurred, and in two cases someone has tried to trace the letters in pencil. The first

Once the tracing is correct (line 20), the second time not quite (line 24 reads ܐܡܬܐܕܐܬܐ, as printed by Mingana and translated by Tonneau). But line 21 begins with a word that Mingana read as ܐܠܐܝܬܐ; Tonneau's translation follows this reading: "et par lui", "and through him". But it seems to me that the word in question

ܡܥܬܐܕܐܬܐ (remember that this is Nestorian script!): "and through his garment", "et par son vêtement", which fits the context very well. If one compares the two translations of this passage on the two sides of the tradentals, the following emerges: In the friendly tradition, there are two cases of slight simplification:

⁶ Further information on De incarnatione in add. 14.669 can be found in my contribution to the Festschrift for Sebastian Brock, which is to appear in 1995 [here in this volume pp. 29-36]. - As far as Theodore's commentary on John is concerned, a translation of the first 20 pages of Vosté's edition (CSCO 115/116 Syri 62/63), i.e. the dedication, the argumentum and the beginning of the first book, revealed in an exercise with students that at any rate these pages contain a slavishly literal translation of great awkwardness. One can of course recognize this from Vosté's Latin translation of the Syriac. Was the Syriac version perhaps intended as a reading translation for school use in Edessa, where it was placed alongside the Greek original?

a) In the opposing tradition, "the one Lord" is predicated as "he who is of that nature which is one and divine, of which the Father is". In the friendly tradition it reads: "who is of the divine nature of God the Father".

b) Another predication in the opposing fragment is: "of whom the angel says in what manner it was fitting that he should be called" - this alludes to Lk 1:32. In the friendly tradition we read: "because he is the man of whom the angel says that he should be called Jesus" - an allusion to Luke 1:31. This latter version is easier to understand, since a direct statement is made, but on this occasion it replaces the phrase "it was fitting" so characteristic of Theodore. Without question, the Syriac version of the hostile fragment collection is the rendering of the genuine text. One also notes the translation of "assume" (*assumere*), which is really sufficiently Theodoric, by "clothe himself", which can be regarded as a Syriacization; "being in him" is rendered by the stronger "dwelt in him"; "gives knowledge of himself in him" becomes "revealed through his garment". These observations can be summarized as an "Antiochianization" of an already Antiochian text, without changing the meaning.

When Rudolf Abramowski drew attention in 1934 (ZNW vol. 33) to the then recent publication of the Catechetical Homilies by Mingana, he wrote that the Latin version of the Council excerpts from the Homilies should now be examined in the light of the Syriac translation of the complete text. His own first general observation was that the Syriac translation in most cases makes better sense than the often rather obscure Latin; and that furthermore the Latin excerpts had been treated to the disadvantage of the author (p. 68). On p. 69, R. Abramowski juxtaposed the two Syriac versions of the excerpt from the Homilies that we have just discussed, but he did not evaluate the differences, as we have just done. He then compared the Latin fragments individually [6] with the complete Syriac translation. His final judgment is that the Syriac translation is easier to read and understand - here we agree with him; therefore it seemed to him to reproduce the original more faithfully. Although it is my father, I cannot agree with this; the reverse is much more correct.

Let us now return to Theodore's Christological text in the differing versions in add. 12.156 and 14.669. Köbert correctly notes that the translation of 12.516 presents a coherent line of argument in which every argument and every comparison has its place, whereas add. 14.669 presents only a loose chain of thoughts. I do not need to present his proof in detail, and I have already mentioned Köbert's results. But I can cite additional observations which make it impossible to regard add. 14.669 as a rendering of the author's authentic text (at least at this point). Add. 12.156 has an extremely difficult passage about the inner and outer man, which has been radically simplified and shortened in 14.669 (and

may even have been used incorrectly). Fortunately, there is a Latin parallel in Facundus to add. 12.156, a parallel not to the text but to the thought, which makes Theodor's opinion somewhat clearer, although the translation of the Syriac still remains difficult. It is impossible that the shorter, simpler form of the text in add. 14.669 should have developed into the complicated arrangement that add. 12.156. Finally, we find on the Page from add. 14.669 the expression ܠܥܕܬܐ ܠܥܕܬܐ πρόσωπον τῆς ἐνώσεως, which is a term used by the late Nestorius, but never by Theodore, as far as I can see; add. 12.156 *does not* have the term.

At this point in my work on the collection of Theodor fragments in add.

12.156 After a good 30 years, I picked up F. A. Sullivan's book "The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia" from 1956 and read chapters 2 and 3 again, i.e. the main body of this work (p. 35-158). In it, Sullivan discusses the reliability of the opposing tradition of the Theodore fragments and examines the evidence of falsifications as compiled by Devreesse. Richard and Devreesse are sharply criticized, and the author takes his own stand in the debate of the time on the re-evaluation of Antiochian theology. Since such (to put it mildly) conservative theologians as Ortiz de Urbina, Diepen and Parente are mentioned with approval, Sullivan's book must (and should) appear as an expression of unfriendly sentiment towards Theodore's defenders, who sought evidence for their view in the Antiochene and Nestorian tradition of their hero's works. Here it must be said reluctantly (reluctantly, because we all held Marcel Richard in such high esteem and still revere his great scholarship), but clearly, that Sullivan's examination of the relationships of the various traditions to each other and to the translations is methodologically flawless. And his observations on the various degrees of freedom in the Syriac translations of Theodore are extremely useful. But it by no means follows from this that his view of the

"Nestorianism" of Theodore, Nestorius and their friends.

3 Theodore's fragments in add. 12.156

In his essay on the transmission of Theodore's *De incarnatione* (now *Opera minora*, 1977, no. 41), Richard treats our collection only in an appendix (p.72-74), in line with his disparaging judgment of the opposing transmission. Nevertheless, his notes are very helpful. As I said, he did not include the fragments in this collection that were *not* from *De incarnatione* in his study. Therefore, these fragments are not referred to in *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* and also not in a list that I compiled in a small essay on the whole Hs. add. 12.156; this essay, written many years earlier, was only published in 1987 in "Texte und

Textkritik" (= Texte und Untersuchungen 133) [here in this volume pp. 3-9]. In it I give an overview of the contents of add. 12.156, which departs from the usual lists based on Wright's catalog. The "Blasphemies of Diodorus, Theodore and Nestorius" are No. VIII in my classification. Together with Nos. VI, VII and IX, this No. VIII belongs to the part of the Hs. that denounces Antiochene theology, while the framework is directed against Chalcedon and the *Tomus Leonis*.

In his counting of the fragments, Richard has overlooked the fact that no. 9 consists of two pieces, which I distinguish as a) and b). No. 24 is the last fragment of *De incarnatione*, the appendix continues to No. 33. I have divided No. 25 into two pieces, as required by the extant Greek original, although in Syriac the interruption is not indicated by a lemma, unless one can take a group of three dots as a clue, because such three dots often, but not always, indicate the end of an excerpt.

The larger number of fragments is not known from other traditions: Nos. 2-10. 15. 17. 18. 21-24. 26. 28. 29. 33, i.e. 17 excerpts from *De incarnatione* and 4 in the appendix. Nos. 16 and 19 have parallels only in add. 14.669, as does the first movement of no. 20; the rest of the fragment has also survived in Latin. Richard thought that no. 12 had no parallel, but even before him R. Abramowski had found the corresponding passage in Greek in the excerpts from Leontius.

We know that *De incarnatione* was divided into books and chapters, with [8] the chapter numbering being continuous through the books. Our compiler only gives the chapter numbers, the fragments are from chapters 11. 33. 35. 36. 37. 38. 50. 51. 56. 59. 60. 63 (the famous Christological fragment comes from this chapter). 66. 73. 77. The fragments are mostly short, one of the exceptions being quotation no. 16 from c. 63. The extracts produced by the collector concentrate on the distinction between the Logos and the assumed man in Christ and on the completeness of his human nature. It is clear that the notion of man (ἄνθρωπος) in Christ⁷ was developed against Apollinarius and his specific Christological understanding of ἄνθρωπος, where the "man" (not the flesh) is "from heaven" (according to I Cor. 15:47). The compiler's interest is of course not directed at Apollinarius, but we do not understand *Theodore* properly if we do not perceive what he was fighting against.

⁷ In the commentary on John 1:14, Theodore refers the reader to *De incarnatione*, aptly calling the work "the volume we have written *on the humanity of our Lord*" (115 p. 34,18f/116 p. 23,33).

1.4 The remains of the Syriac translation of Theodore of Mopsuestia, *De Incarnatione*, in Add. 14.6691

In 1869, Eduard Sachau published the remains of a Syriac translation of *De incarnatione* by Theodore of Mopsuestia.² These are 18 parchment leaves, or rather the remains of such leaves, which are kept at the beginning of add. 14.669 in the British Museum, now the British Library. Sachau's edition was published before Wright's catalog (1870-72) of the Syriac manuscripts; the catalog already mentions the edition in the description of add. 14.669 already mentions the edition. According to Wright's description, add. 14.669 is only the remainder of *De incarnatione*; in fact, the volume now contains 59 leaves from various hands, larger and smaller remnants of manuscripts that are just as anonymous as the pieces from *De incarnatione* due to the loss of leaves. We probably have Sachau to thank for the identification of the author. During the sorting process, the page numbers of the volume have shifted, as can be seen from the crossed-out numbers (the pagination was done in pencil). Occasionally, a biblical passage is indicated in pencil in the margin.

Due to the poor condition of the surviving leaves, Sachau often had to add letters or words; the additions appear in square brackets in the printed text. Beyond the fact of the edition as such, these additions are probably his lasting [24] merit. As far as I can see, no one has since compared the entire ms. with the print. I hardly expect to be able to improve the additions made by the Semitist Sachau. When translating, I have only had to change his additions in two or three cases for reasons of content.

In his Latin translation, Sachau did not reproduce the remains of sentences that stood at the beginning or end of the pages or the legible sections on the pages. Above all, he did not completely incorporate into the translation what

¹ Part of the following was presented at the Symposium syriacum in Cambridge in August 1992. After the conference, I began comparing the ms. and Sachau's print in London; this led to minor changes to the speech text. - In my presentation at the Syriac Congress in Kottayam (Kerala) in 1990, I discussed the problem of which side of the tradition of *De incarnatione* contains the authentic text: the decision was *against* Richard. See Abramowski, L, "On the fragments of Theodore of Mopsuestia in Brit. Libr. add. 12156 and the christological fragment in double tradition", *The Harp. A Review of Syriac and Oriental Studies*, 6 (1993), 199-206. A German version augmented by some notes, *Oriens Christianus*, 79 (1995), 1-8 [here in this volume pp. 22-28]. In the third section of the essay, instead of ACO IV 2, we read: ACO IV 1 [corrected here - ed.]

² *Theodori Mopsuestensi fragmenta syriaca*, p. ٢٤٦- ٢٤٧ Syriac text, pp. 28-57 Latin translation.

of information about books and chapters of *De incarnatione can be found in Syriac*. The consequence of this is, firstly, that he himself makes a superfluous false arrangement of two leaves and, secondly, that Marcel Richard in his famous essay on the transmission of *De incarnatione*³ does not mention the chapter "43" on f. 4 b col. 1.4 Richard could have found the information in Wright's catalog, but he does not cite the catalog, no doubt prevented from doing so by the war and occupation.⁵

Wright described the manuscripts in the second volume of his catalog (p. 483): the leaves are all more or less "stained, torn, and mutilated". In addition to the complete information on the number of books and chapters, there is also a statement that the

number of a layer (quire) has been preserved: ٩, thus 9, on f. 6 b; Sachau had not adopted this. Furthermore, we hear that the capitulatio of Book IX - 63. 64. 65 - was changed "sub- sequently" to 64. 65. 66. Sachau does not mention this either. Devreesse in his *Essai*⁶ did not take note of this either.⁷ In the

Indeed, in add. 12.156, the piece which in our manuscript represents the end of VIII. Book, is marked with the indication of origin "from c. 63". Unfortunately, Wright does not say whether the subsequent change was made by the hand of the first scribe and whether "63" was also changed to '64' after the capitulatio at the beginning of the new chapter. The autopsy revealed that the corrections to the capitulatio are only faintly perceptible, i.e. they were not written in the same ink, and were therefore not made by the first scribe.

are from the same hand. The [25] change from ٩ to ٦ is barely recognizable. At the beginning of c. 63 = 64, the tiny ٦- hook is only noticeable to those who have not overlooked the preceding changes in the number signs.

The leaves in the manuscript were probably counted during the inventory at the British Museum. Wright remarks: "Whether the leaves, as now arranged, are in correct sequence, is very uncertain". Sachau has carried out a new arrangement⁸,

³ Richard, M, "La tradition des fragments du traité Περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως de Théodore de Mopsueste", *Le Muséon*, 46 (1943), 55-75 = *Opera minora*, II, No 41.

⁴ p. 63.

⁵ His essay appeared in the *Muséon* in 1943.

⁶ Devreesse, R., *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, (Studi e testi, 141, Città del Vaticano, 1948).

⁷ p. 47 above.

⁸ It prints the sheets in the following order

f. 3 p. 28 / ٣٨

f. 5 p. 30 / ٥٣,

f. 6 p. 32 / ٦٢

f. 8 p. 34 / ٨٤

f. 2 p. 35 / ٢٥

f. 4 p. 36 / ٤٦

f. 7 p. 38 / ٧٨

f. 14 p. 40 / ١٤٠

f. 10 p. 43 / ١٠٤٣

f. 12 p. 45 / ١٢٤٥

But this only "increases the disorder", as Richard rightly says.⁹ Under no circumstances should Sachau have placed leaves 12/13 before f. 11, because f. 11 contains the beginning of Book XI, f. 12 b has the running page title "Book XI", as Sachau himself states as a note to the Syriac text.¹⁰

Richard's own compilation of the textual information on books and chapters¹¹ is not entirely complete and contains mix-ups and errors. Devreesse then produced a complete overview of the content and structure of *De incarnatione*, taking into account all branches of tradition [26],¹² but, as already mentioned, did not take into account the correction of the Capitulatio in add. 14.669 was not taken into account. The various traditionaries proceed differently and without consistency with the information on the division of *De incarnatione*, only the Florileg in add.

12.156 always gives the chapter number, but never the book. Devreesse's compilation would of course be even more helpful if he had *always*, and not just sometimes, given the page numbers of add. 14.669 and not, as is usually the case, only the page numbers from Sachau's Latin translation. Even after Devreesse, uncertainties remain that cannot be eliminated because there is a lack of material. His arrangement of the leaves (which, however, must be deduced) is more accurate than that of Sachau. However, he too did not realize that leaf 5 had to be turned, i.e. recto becomes verso - this is an observation that Rud. Abramowski recorded in his hand copy of Sachau. This means that leaves 8 and 14 cannot be inserted between 5 and 6, as Devreesse¹³ did, because 6 follows f. 5 b (new).

The translator of add. 14.669 must have had occasional difficulties with Theodor's Greek and with Greek in general. There are passages where, despite Sachau's Latin translation, I have not yet succeeded in producing a comprehensible German translation. Sachau's translation is not free of errors either, but its mere existence is of course very helpful.

I am now sharing such cases where the Syrian translator reveals his ineptitude in translating individual words and terms. These are all passages without

f. 13 p. 47 / ܡܕ

f. 11 p. 49 / ܡܕ

f. 9 p. 50 / ܡܕ

f. 16 p. 51 / ܡܕ

f. 17 p. 52 / ܡܕ

f. 1 p. 54 / ܡܕ

f. 15 p. 55 / ܡܕ

9 p. 62. See also the individual corrections in Richard, p. 62 n. 32, but they are not error-free.

10 p. ܡܕ.

11 p. 62 f.

12 p. 45-48 in the Essai.

13 p. 46.

Parallel tradition. In the translation of f. 3, Sachau¹⁴ mentions *apprehensio localis* twice and *apprehensio opinionis* once. The governing noun in Syriac is ܠܗܝܠܝܬܐ "to hold fast", which makes no sense. In the Greek questions, I finally found the only possible Greek equivalents *σχέσις τόπω* and *σχέσις τῆς γνώμης*, both used in constructions with *κατά*. *σχέσις* then means "relationship, relation". Neither in Brockelmann nor in the Thesaurus did I find the Syriac word in this meaning. Since I am already at f. 3, I would like to point out the thoughtless use of a Peshitta quotation, where the literal translation of the Greek biblical text would have been necessary for the train of thought. The verb "to become" is discussed because of John 1:14; Theodore quotes 1 Cor. 11:1, among others.

"become my imitators", *μυμηταί μου* [27] *γίνεσθε*; the translator renders with the Peshitta: "imitate me" - which of course spoils the point.

On leaves 5/6 a Syriac ܠܝܬܐ, "with", appears, which must translate a Greek *μετά*, but which in the original had the sense of "to". The correct translation would therefore have been ܠܝܬܐ.

It is not surprising that the translator of f. 14 uses the Greek *θατεραλήπτοι* has its trouble. This is an expression from Euseb's Church History, which Theodore uses here. PGL s. v. can only translate this ironic word with a small phrase: "able to be caught by other means".

f. 16/17 "fallen" literally translates the Greek *πίπτω*, which at this point is only understandable in the sense of "be applied to, relate to" (PGL s.v.: E), i.e. would have required a different Syriac vocabulary.

f. 15 the translator did not realize that the Greek *πρό*, which he translated as "before"

here means "instead of", for which ܠܝܬܐ should have been chosen.

Some passages in add. 14.669 are known to have parallels in the other traditions, the longest and most discussed being the end of VIII. A general impression gained from comparing the parallels is that add. 14.669 is abridged. This procedure is most conspicuous at the end of Book VIII, which may also be due to the fact that the underlying comparative material is more extensive than in the other cases. The abridgements always serve a formal simplification. This can consist in omitting a second verb if the sentence can also be constructed with one verb; or an adjective can be simplified or even omitted altogether; or a sentence construction of Theodor's that is exactly parallel in thought and form is blurred and its second member is contracted.

In the already mentioned famous Christological text from the end of Book VIII, from c. 63 after add. 12.156 and the corrected count in add. 14.669, there is also a deliberate reworking of Christological terminology, which consists in the fact that the doctrine of the two *πρόσωπα*, which was developed from the point of view of the

¹⁴ p. 28,17; 29, 18 f; 29,2.

unity of the two natures is one πρόσωπον has been radically eliminated, even for the anthropological comparison. Instead, there are two *hypostases* that form a *hypostasis* and a πρόσωπον.¹⁵ In the unedited text, too, there are two

[28] Hypostases: for body and soul in man; but in the Christological case, hypostasis is expressly spoken of only for the Logos; only the adaptation has qnōma, hypostasis, also for the human nature of Christ. The basic Antiochian formula: two natures and one πρόσωπον is of course common to both versions. Users of the translation, which is partially preserved by add. 14.669 could no longer recognize that the Christology of the two πρόσωπα, which are one πρόσωπον, as it is richly elaborated in Nestorius and Ps. Nestorius in the Liber Heraclidis, has its source in this text of *De incarnatione*.

One has the impression that the two-prosopic Christology was only hinted at in this passage of *De incarnatione*; the hostile tradition would otherwise hardly have refrained from presenting several such statements; conversely, this chapter in particular is quoted from extraordinarily frequently.

It has already been noticed earlier that add. 14.669 in other places where the one Christological πρόσωπον appears, nowhere does it automatically add "one hypostasis".¹⁶ But in these passages the two natures are not defined more precisely as two hypostases and two prosopa, so that there was no need to intervene to correct the non-existent differentiation.

Because of the few remnants that remain of the edited translation, the number of parallels from the other tradition is not large; they exist only for four passages of add. 14.669. Firstly, there is a case where only add. 12.156 provides a parallel, no. 19 according to Richard's count, which I retain; it is a passage from Book XI, Secondly, a text where, in addition to a parallel in add. 12.156 (no. 20), a smaller passage in Latin has been handed down by the Acts of the Council, also from Book XI, c. 73. Thirdly, a passage with a Latin parallel in the Acts of the Council and in Vigilius and a somewhat shorter one in Leontius, from Book XIII, c. 78. And finally, fourthly, the astonishing coincidence that from Book VIII, c. 63, of all places, our manuscript has preserved a remainder that is longer than the many quotations from it in add.

12.156 (no. 16), in Leontius and in the Latin sources.

[29] One wonders whether the Antiochian-Nestorian theological literature in Syriac was really only based on the translation of *De incarnatione*, the remains of which are preserved in add. 14.669. Devreesse quotes at the end

¹⁵ These differences come out best when add. 14.669 and add. 12.156 next to each other, if possible in the same line, because both witnesses have a part in common [28] which Leontius has omitted. Sullivan, F A, *The christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, (Rome, 1956), has long since noted the differences, but in his detailed debate with Richard on the one hand and Diepen on the other (64 ff.) his comments on this are somewhat lost. Because of the existing Leontius excerpts, he did not consult add. 12156 no. 16.

¹⁶ Sullivan, 62 with n. 64.

of his *Essai*¹⁷ some lines from the *Synodicon orientale*:¹⁸ "C'est ce que dit le bienheureux Théodore dans son livre Sur l'Incarnation, chapitre huitième, où il affirme clairement deux natures et deux hypostases dans l'unique personne du Christ, Fils de Dieu". The word "chapitre" is translated *mēmra*, i.e. book.¹⁹ Devreesse cites the Synod of 612 as the source, but these are excerpts from the *Vita* of the martyr George (Giwargis), which was written by Babai the Great and in which Babai's Christology is put into the hero's mouth - a martyr's biography was a good way of spreading this theology even among unlearned Christians. Chabot does indeed offer the excerpts as a supplement to the document of 612, which was also written by Babai; he gives the excerpts in translation, the Syriac text must be read in Bedjan's edition²⁰. It is pleasing that Chabot translates *qnōmā* here as hypostasis; in the other translations in his volume he misleadingly uses "personne" for *qnōmā*. It is noteworthy that Babai also relies on the passage from *De incarnatione*, Book VIII, which has already been discussed several times (it is certainly c. 63); this confirms the assumption expressed above that this was the only passage in the work where one could find anything of the kind. As we know, Babai opposes the one composite hypostasis of Christ as taught by the New Chalcedonians, at least by Emperor Justinian, and Henana of Nisibis. The topic is explicitly addressed in the context of the quotation from the *Vita* of Giwargis. Which translation of Theodor's *De incarnatione* did Babai have in mind? The ironic fact is that, on the one hand, the revised version makes the two Christological hypostases stand out much more clearly than the hostile tradition - it would therefore have been better suited as an authority for Babai; but on the other hand, the revised version also introduces the *one* hypostasis in Christ, which made it completely unsuitable for Babai's argumentation. Are we to play with the idea that Babai did not have to reckon with the [30] addressees of the *Georgsvita* looking up Theodore? But what if a well-read monk had done so? Or if Henana supporters had put their finger on Babai's vulnerable argumentation? One would therefore like to assume that Babai knew a more precise translation of *De incarnatione*, but one cannot go beyond this assumption (it is also more like a wish).

It has long been known that Theodor bar Koni quotes from the edited version of *De incarnatione* VIII in his *Scholia*,²¹ with omissions (which he does not indicate as such). This can be found in Book IX of the *Scholia*; section 3

¹⁷ p. 276 n. 6.

¹⁸ Ed. Chabot, J-B, (Paris, 1902), 627.

¹⁹ So also correct Braun, O, see the next note.

²⁰ Bedjan, P, (ed). *Histoire de Mar-Jabalah*, (Paris, 1895)². The quoted passage, 499. A German translation of the history of George in *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, vol. 22 (1915), by Oskar Braun, the quotation p. 249.

²¹ Cf. *Sullivan*, 70 ff.

deals with the question: "Where is a *qnōmā* in Christ proclaimed?" First of all, bar Koni quotes three times from the baptismal catecheses; where he says a hypostasis, the manuscript on which the modern editions of the catecheses are based speaks of a prosopon (Tonneau/Devreesse mark the places where bar Koni deviates). For the catecheses, one must therefore reckon with the fact that there were two not quite identical forms of the Syriac translation as far as the termini for unity in Christ were concerned. In any case, the Christology of the one hypostasis is not the bar Koni's; if the heading of IX 3 could still be seen as a theoretical problem, the heading of IX 4 indicates a real aporia for the Nestorians: "If the blessed interpreter and the Fathers before him used the vocabulary 'one hypostasis' in Christ, why do we reject it now?"²² The next, X. book of bar Koni's Scholia consists of a catechetical-controverstheological dialog that works with the Christology of the two πρόσωπα; the ἀσύγχυτος ἔνωσις of both results in the one πρόσωπον of the one Christ. Since bar Koni obviously only knew Theodore's *De incarnatione* in the edited version, this writing cannot be the source of his Christology of the two πρόσωπα; rather, he must have taken the latter directly or indirectly from Nestorius' Liber Heraclidis, which had been available in translation since the 6th century. In his edition of the Scholia of bar Koni, Scher has provided variants from his Hss. for the quotation from *De incarnatione*;²³ as far as individual words are concerned (n. 4-7), the variants reflect the textual form of add. [31] 14.669. The variant reported in n. 8 largely repairs the second²⁴ of the two omissions in the quotation, not without a clarifying intervention in Theodor's text (Scher makes no reference to add. 14.669 or Sachau). The translation of Scher's edition was not published until 1981 and 1982,²⁵ to the credit of R. Hespel and R. Draguet. In their rendering of the Christological passages, the translation of *qnōmā* as "personne" and of πρόσωπον as "personnage" irritates me; the consistent application of this procedure leads to the grotesque formulation in the translation of Mt 27:30

"Ils crachèrent sur son personnage"²⁶ for "They spied on his face". In their On the one hand, the two editors are decidedly old-fashioned with regard to the Theodore citations²⁷: the baptismal catecheses are cited according to Mingana instead of Tonneau/Devreesse, the Council Acts according to Mansi instead of ACO IV 1. 14.669 is not mentioned at all in Sachau's edition; there is also no reference to the discussion that began in the 1940s about the two super-

²² Cf. already Scher, A, 1910 on bar Koni IX 3, quoted by Devreesse, *Essai*, 276 n. 6.

²³ *Liber Scholiorum*, 11th volume, CSCO. 69 (syr. 26) 1912, 190 n. 4-8.

²⁴ Perhaps a homoioarctone is to blame for this omission.

²⁵ Volume I: CSCO. 431 (syr. 187); II: 432 (188).

²⁶ X 5, p. 197.

²⁷ In addition, see Devreesse, p.276 n. 6 for the citations.

forms of delivery of the Theodore text. And last but not least, this much-discussed text has been forgotten in the index of quotations!

Because Draguet and Hespel did not take note of Sachau's edition, they cannot judge the function of the long variant in Schers n. 8. They say: two Hss. "portent une variante, de l'autorité de laquelle il est difficile de juger".²⁸ In the translation they contaminate the beginning of both versions.²⁹ In the meantime, Hespel has also edited the additions to the Urmia versions of the Scholia,³⁰ but there is nothing about Theodore of Mopsuestia in them. Finally, if one asks how the reliability of add. 14.669 as a translation in those parts where there is no parallel tradition to check (and that is the main mass), my answer would be that, apart from VIII 63, the material should be used to supplement the otherwise known text - if it [32] can be translated! As already mentioned, VIII 63 must have been a special case of terminological differentiation in Theodore's original Greek. And in its form, revised by the translator, the chapter presents us with a variety of Antiochian Christology of which I know of no other example.

28 CSCO. 432, p. 141 n. 13.

29 You write p. 141,20: "Et c'est pourquoi il a dit que", which comes from the variant; it should read: "Et en cette (matière)".

30 CSCO. 464. 465 (syr. 197. 198), 1984.

1.5 Theodor of Mopsuestia

Fragments from the manuscript add. 12156 of the British Museum, translated and explained

[Editorial note by the editor]

[Text, similes and annotations follow, as far as possible, the wording and arrangement of the typescript (dated "December 30, 1990" and designated as "1st manuscript stage") from the estate of Luise Abramowski in the Tübingen University Library. In addition to (annotated) copies of photographs from the Hs. British Library (formerly British Museum), add. 12156, fol. 79v-89v, and (annotated) copies of the edition by Lagarde (*Analecta Syriaca*, Leipzig 1858, reprint Osnabrück 1967, p. 100-108), several (mostly undated, certainly already partly out of order since the time of editing) copies have been found within the relevant estate collection. These can be linked to the information provided by L. A. in her publications (cf. in this volume pp. 3-9.22-36):

a) the typescript (dated 14. 12. 88 by L. A.) of the translation by P. Köbert (10 A4 pages), originally entitled "P. de Lagardes syrische Theodor v. Mopsuestia-Fragmente übersetzt", but the title has been crossed out by L. A.,

b) hsl. Corrections to this translation on Köbert's typescript,

c) a table with notes, sometimes referred to as an "apparatus" in the headers, as an overview of the contents of the Syriac manuscript add. 12156, with its foliation (79v-90r) and, like the latter, laid out in three columns (in order to gain space for the entry of parallels and similes, which is missing on the copy of the photograph),

d) Draft (three A4 pages, three quarters of the first page used, the other two sheets annotated) of a *praefatio* entitled "Raymond Köbert (†), *Die Fragmente des Theodor von Mopsuestia aus P. de Lagarde, Anallecta Syriaca, übersetzt und eingeleitet* von Luise Abramowski"; some of the wording can be found in later publications (here in this volume pp. 22-36),

e) a hand-written synoptic compilation entitled "Theodor[-]Fragmente aus add. 12156", a hand-written synoptic compilation of the Syriac fragments from add. 12156 and add. 14.669 to frg. 16, 19 and 20 as well as two texts from add. 14669, one of which is compiled synoptically with the corresponding Leontius text, one synoptically with the corresponding Theodor bar Koni text (taking into account an important hsl. variant), in the scope of 9 DIN A4 pages. Only for frg. 16 had L. A. the synoptic comparison between add. 12.156 and add. 14.669 into the ab-

typed manuscript version (*h*). For frg. 19 and 20, this was supplemented on the basis of the manuscript synopses. The latter two synopses of the parallel texts to add. 14.669 were compiled in the two appendices from this provisional manuscript.

f) Fragment of a manuscript, titled "Die Exzerpte aus Th. v. M / De Incarnatione in add. 12156 / Übersetzung + App.", of which only the title page and the four hsl. paginated DIN A4 pages 7-10 have survived,

g) a final manuscript version (36 A4 pages + one inserted note), undated and untitled, which has become known in copied form among her students,

h) the dated typescript mentioned at the very beginning (40 DIN A4 pages) with a few handwritten annotations. This was therefore the basis for the print. Underlinings in the typescript are in italics, the fragment numbers in double round brackets (()) are in bold. References to other textual levels, further additions and other aids to understanding are placed in square brackets, some of which are referred to in the notes, while others are left in plain text. - The fact that no definitive "final version" prepared for printing has survived, but only a first (!) manuscript stage, had to be taken into account. Occasionally, use was made of the possibility of indicating an alternative understanding of the text in the annotations; the few, careful interventions in the text have been meticulously recorded, as the aim here is to show L. A.'s understanding of the sometimes extremely difficult texts. For the sake of the greatest possible transparency, L. A.'s German translation is accompanied by the Syriac text according to ed. Lagarde and compared again with the photographs in the manuscript from L. A.'s estate. The typographical signs of the addition [] printed in the Syriac text without an equivalent in the hsl. The typographical errors in Lagarde's typescript which L. A. criticized in the annotation apparatus of her typescript have been corrected in the text, and their explanations have been placed in the text: where necessary, appropriate references are given in the annotations. - In the manuscript version (*g*), there are now and then keyword-like and more extensive formulations, which are perhaps conceptual precursors to the version announced on the title page of the typescript (*h*), which was not yet finalized.

L. A., however, apparently no longer elaborated "explanation" - i.e. as hints for interpretation, which were then no longer pursued and, together with the rest of the convolute, were ultimately left behind. As L. A. no longer took these notes, some of which were scribbled down in passing, into account when compiling the typescript (*h*) - we do not know the reasons for this - they have not been included here].

1 f. 83v col. 2 (Lagarde p. 100,25-30)

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ

From chapter 11 After the resurrection,
 when the ^{disciples}¹ were led by the Holy ^{Spirit}²
 , they received

also perfect by revelation
 knowledge, that they might know that
 his excellency, which surpassed that of
 other men, was not in a mere glory from
 God, as was that of ^{other}³ men, but
 through union with the God Logos, by
 which he shares in all glory with him
 after the ascension to heaven.

Sachau p. 63.

1 = end of citation XXV 31 *ex libro primo de incarnatione* Council 553: ACO IV 1 p. 55,6-10 = end of
 citation c. XXVI Const. Vig. without lemmata: Coll. Avell. p. 260, 17-23
 Swete II p. 291,7-12 [cf. Jansen frg. I (p. 233,6-10)].

¹ added by the excerptor

² missing *ad scientiam*

³ ms. and Lagarde ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ, hence Sachau *aliorum veritatis*, but to be read ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ, as shortly
 afterwards; proved by f. 84v col. 3 to be a translation of λουτοί.

[The Syriac text is emended according to the conjecture of n. 3 - *ed.*]

2 fol. 83v col. 2-84r col. 1 (Lagarde p. 101,1-17)

מן תחילת דבר, וְהָיָה כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶל הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 לְבָרָא אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא

אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא

אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא

אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא
 אֶת הָעוֹלָם, וְעַד כִּי יָבוֹא

From the beginning of chapter 33, where the apostle said: "As through one man sin entered into the world, and through sin death" (Rom. 5:12),

So too is "grace" through a human being. Jesus Christ has abounded in many" (Rom. 5:15), it is incumbent on ^{all1} to explore what can be learned from the words

of the ^{apostle2} is emphasized when they (only) truly learn as the apostles obeying foolish words. By they do not obey them, ask They ask us: What is the solution to the problem (ζήτημα)? And to this we respond joyfully, taking credit for it: it is the advocacy of the apostolic words. And we say that it would have been fitting for man to

in his way of life the disobedience would have overcome them together. But because mere man, when he struggled with sins, was not able to overcome them.

power, namely by

was rooted in our nature through the length of time and because the soul had previously become its possession, in that it (sin) easily subdued the one who wanted to fight with it, (otherwise it would have been defeated from the fight against it), - (because this was so), the indwelling of the God Logos became necessary, while the will of life was preserved from man without harm through the help but of the God Logos.

Sachau p. 63 f. - Without parallel tradition.

¹ here was certainly κοινόν and that also has the meaning

² ms. and Lagarde: plural, but probably false assimilation

This gave him the complete ability to easily escape sin and overcome the disobedience that had arisen at the beginning of our creation.

3 f. 84r col. 1-2 (Lagarde p. 101,18-102,3)

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ
 ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ

From chapter 35: But the battles of our Lord do not seem to have been done to acquire virtue for us, but rather for the sake of a ^{display1}. But if this cannot be said, then it is clear that it was for our sake that he waged a great battle against the passions of the soul, but a small one against those of the flesh; for the sake of

how much more likely they were to resist hen. That is, it was this (the soul) that was more in need of healing. And it is clear that when he took on flesh and soul, he (i.e. the Logos) was in battle for both. Having put to death the sins in the flesh and subdued its desires, he caused them also to be easily healed.

were defeated by a better thoughts of the soul. But he instructed the soul and taught it to subdue its own passions and to suppress the desires of the flesh. This is what the Godhead began to impart to each of them (i.e. flesh and soul). And it was also the grace of the Holy ^{Spirit2} that helped in this, as the blessed apostle also said:

"Truly great is the mystery of the fear of the Lord, who was manifested in the flesh and justified in the

Sachau p. 64 - Without parallel tradition.

¹ Lagarde reads ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ, as does Sachau, who notes, however, that the ms. reads ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ. R. Abramowski therefore corrects Sachau's translation by hand, as does Köbert; this is also required by the meaning. In fact, the manuscript has ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ (in two words), and something is scribbled in between, which I can no longer read in my photograph.

² A printing error in Lagarde confuses syr. "d" and "r" [and has been corrected here after the ms. d. Editor]

Spirit" (1 Tim 3:16), because we also expect to receive the help of the Spirit for the perfecting of righteousness.

7 f. 84r col. 3-f. 84v col. 1 (Lagarde p. 102,17-103,4)

ק ר, וְהָיָה לְהַחֲזִיק בְּכָל הַיּוֹם, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח
 מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:
 לֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:

וְהָיָה לְהַחֲזִיק בְּכָל הַיּוֹם, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח
 מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:
 לֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:

וְהָיָה לְהַחֲזִיק בְּכָל הַיּוֹם, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח
 מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:
 לֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:
 וְהָיָה לְהַחֲזִיק בְּכָל הַיּוֹם, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח
 מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:
 לֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:

וְהָיָה לְהַחֲזִיק בְּכָל הַיּוֹם, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח
 מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:
 לֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:

וְהָיָה לְהַחֲזִיק בְּכָל הַיּוֹם, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח
 מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:
 לֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:
 וְהָיָה לְהַחֲזִיק בְּכָל הַיּוֹם, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח
 מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:
 לֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:
 וְהָיָה לְהַחֲזִיק בְּכָל הַיּוֹם, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח
 מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ, וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:
 לֹא יִשְׁכַּח מִלִּפְנֵי הַיְיָ:

From chapter 38. but it also reveals the word of our Lord, who says:

"Do not be afraid of those who

Killing the body but not the soul can. But be more afraid of

the one who brings the soul and the body into the

can destroy hell" (Mt 10:28). So then

their thought is rebuked, which is foolish.

For the one (Apollinaris) who looks at

the will of the soul reproves in the

same way the assumption of the flesh

with the soul, which is superfluid. But

this is not so. The excellence [of the

soul] arises from the will. This (sc. the

will)

but also needs the help of God to do so,

because he is inclined (to evil) to sin

is drawn to. And therefore, as

Our Lord accepted man, he gave him as a

great good that he removed from his

flesh the ingrained sin and from his soul

the easy temptation to the passions and

the inclination to sin. Thus he removed

from the flesh the *fierceness* of desire that

is in it, but eradicated from the soul the

power of the passions, not by removing

the passions (themselves) and the

impulses, for these still stir in both, but

by shaking their *power*. And through his

own conduct of life he gave the right

relationship to the *soul*, he caused it to

become invincible through its own

passions, and through the input of good

thoughts the battle line of those that are

bad was pushed back; to conquer

but also of the desires of the *flesh*
through an inclination to good, in that it
(the soul) was assisted by the help of the
spirit.

9b¹ f. 84v col. 2 (Lagarde p. 103,16-20)

אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ
אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ

אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ
אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ
אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ
אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ אֶתְּכִיָּהּ

And again. They also ask this: Is Christ
one and another the Son
of God, or: is this Christ and ^{that}² Son of
God? And would someone
and say: It is the same, they immediately
^{reject}³ that they have received this as
confirmation of their illness.

Sachau p. 66 - Without parallel tradition.

¹s. n. 1 to 9a

² One should assume that this pronoun should receive a strong diacritical point; Sachau translates more precisely.

³ [Editor's note: Lagarde and Abramowski read אֶתְּכִיָּהּ (from אֶתְּכִיָּהּ reject, accuse, judge, reject), but the ms. clearly reads אֶתְּכִיָּהּ (from אֶתְּכִיָּהּ mean, believe, assume), then one would have to translate: ... they immediately think that they mean this as ...]

10 f. 84v col. 2 (Lagarde p. 103, 21-25)

קדוֹשׁ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיֵשׁוּעַ מְלִיכָנוּ
 וְיֵשׁוּעַ מְלִיכָנוּ. מִיָּדָא לְיֵשׁוּעַ מְלִיכָנוּ
 רַבִּי קִינְיָא. מִיָּדָא לְיֵשׁוּעַ מְלִיכָנוּ
 אֲנִימָא קִינְיָא בְּקִינְיָא. מִיָּדָא לְיֵשׁוּעַ מְלִיכָנוּ
 רַבִּי קִינְיָא. מִיָּדָא לְיֵשׁוּעַ מְלִיכָנוּ
 אֲנִימָא קִינְיָא. מִיָּדָא לְיֵשׁוּעַ מְלִיכָנוּ

From chapter 56: "Wisdom we speak
 among the perfect" (1 Cor. 2:6). Wisdom
 but he has the whole proclamation about
 Christ, through whom they taught
 everyone *that*, by indwelling the God
 Logos, he thus accomplished everything
 in man. But the cross is an honor, not
 because of the nature of the one who
 suffered, but because of the power of
 the one who accepted (him).

Sachau p. 66 - Without parallel tradition.

11 f. 84v col. 2-3 (Lagarde p. 103,26-104,2)

קר, וְ, אֵי רַעְיָהּ אֲדַבֵּר [אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר]
 כְּמִלְכָּהּ וְכִי לְכָרִי מִכָּחַ כְּמִלְכָּהּ, אֲדַבֵּר
 אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר: רַעְיָהּ אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר
 מִכָּחַ אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר
 אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר
 אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר
 אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר
 אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר
 אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר אֲדַבֵּר

From chapter 59. even our ^{Lord}¹, though
afterwards he possessed in himself
 completely the operating God Logos, in
 that the latter possessed undividedly the
 whole influence on him, yet even *before*
that this was very much in him, that he
 did nothing of what was necessary, being
 permitted until before the ^{cross}² to fulfill
 virtue for our sake by his own will
 because of what was necessary, being
 stimulated by him also in this and being
 strengthened to the perfect fulfillment
 of what was due.

Sachau p. 66.

11 = Swete II p. 296,13-19 [= Fragmentum Leontii 2 (p. 458,11-18 ed. Daley); Jansen frg. VII (p. 240,5-12)], contained in one of the long quotations in Leontius, from the 7th book [of *De incarnatione*]

¹gr. "the Lord"

²On "before the cross" cf. Swete II p. 297,16-18 [Jansen frg. VII (p. 241,44-47)].

12 f. 84v col. 3 (Lagarde p. 104,2-6)

[אחרי כן וְאַחֲרָיו מִן הַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם
 וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם
 וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם
 וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם
 וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם
 וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם וְהַטֶּהוֹם

And after another from the same chapter (sc. 59). "For before a child recognizes good or evil, it resists it is for evil to choose good" (Isa 7:1[6]). For if it resists evil but chooses ^{good}¹, then it is clear that through discernment it hates the latter but loves the former. In any case, the choice of evil is made through discernment.

Sachau p. 67.

12 Not unknown, as erroneously stated in Richard p. 73, but = Swete p. 297,19-22 (as already handwritten by R. Abramowski) within a longer quotation in Leontius, from book 7 [of *De incarnatione* = fragmentum Leontii 2 (p. 460,24-27 ed. Daley), Jansen frg. VII (p.241,47-51)].

¹ "If it - but chooses" is missing in the Gr. through homoioteleuton (ἀγαθόν)[;] in any case it is missing [in the fragmen- tum Leontii and correspondingly] in Swete.

14 f. 85r col. 1 (Lagarde p. 104,16-19)

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ

From chapter 60: It was united namely
 with the God ^{Logos}¹ from the beginning,
 who was ^{also}² accepted in foreknowledge
 by receiving the beginning of unity in the
 formation in the womb. But from then
 on, as he became worthy of union, he
 received everything that a human being
 could receive.

Sachau p. 67 does not translate this fragment, but refers to p. 60 no. 2; there our text is part of a somewhat longer excerpt; from p. V one learns that no. 2 comes from a manuscript (add. 12157) of Severus, Ctr. gram., i.e. it is there in a different Syriac translation.

14 = Swete p. 298, 10-12 (not 14, as in Richard p. 73; Richard's line number applies to the Severus fragment from Ctr. Gramm.). Beginning of a longer fragment in Leontius, from book 7 [of *De incarnatione* = *fragmentum Leontii* 4 (p. 464,2-4 ed. Daley); Jansen, frg. IX (p. 242 f.,2-5)]. Severus quotes twice from the same piece, which is preserved in Leontius:

a) somewhat longer in Philalethes, in which it corresponds to our excerpt: CSCO vol. 133 (Script. syr. 68) p. 156,7-11 textus, vol. 134 (69) p. 128,16-21 versio, ed. Hespel. Richard and Devreesse in the *Essai* were still dependent on Sachau's edition;

b) somewhat shorter in Ctr. Grammatic[um]^[1] III 15, therein our excerpt: CSCO 93 (Script. Syri 45) p. 254,14-18 textus, vol. 94 (46) p. 178,30-33 versio ed. Lebon. The origin of the quotation is given there: from the 2nd book of Cyril against Theodore (apparently lost).

1) missing in Greek, but not in Severus

2) missing in Greek and Severus

^[1] [So correct in the manuscript version (*g*)]

15 f. 85r col. 1 (Lagarde p. 104,19-26)

קַמְּמִי וְרִיבִי אֶתְּ [אֶתְּ] אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ
 רִיבִי אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ
 אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ
 אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ

אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ
 אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ
 אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ
 אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ אֶתְּ

From the same chapter (= 60). For if we speak (of him) as God and Creator of the universe and (of) the one who is like the Father and who is with him because of the

natural kinship Revered

speak, (then) we understand (that)

ter) the nature of the Logos. But if we

(speak of him) as the limited one

and of the one who is now above heaven, but will come here at the end with the shaking of the transformation, then we understand (by this) the human being, he who in union with that one receives the honor of all and was deemed worthy of all this glory and comes as judge of the whole world.

Sachau p. 67 - Without parallel tradition.

Chapter 63 From

Man about Lord our What I. Man^{about2} Lord^{our1} What I. אִי כִּי בָּרַךְ הָיָה לְפָנֵינוּ וְלִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים
 she "that has: said wife and she "that has: said wife and אִי כִּי בָּרַךְ הָיָה לְפָנֵינוּ וְלִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים
 not on now of a r e on, now of are two are not, two אִי כִּי בָּרַךְ הָיָה לְפָנֵינוּ וְלִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים
 but one flesh" (Mt 19:6)³, we also say appropriately in reference (= κατά) to the
 but one flesh" (Mt 19:6) so also we say with regard to the way of unification that they
 are not henceforth two but one, and it is clear (that it is so), in that the natures are
 distinguished.

אִי כִּי בָּרַךְ הָיָה לְפָנֵינוּ וְלִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים
 2. And just as it does not harm the number of the two there
 that the flesh should be called "one" - for it is clear in
 what (way)⁴
 "one" is said, the unity of
 πρόσωπον does not detract
 from the difference of natures.

אִי כִּי בָּרַךְ הָיָה לְפָנֵינוּ וְלִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים
 3. For when we distinguish the natures, we say that the
 nature of the God

2. For just as there the number two is not cut off from
 the fact that they are to be called one flesh - for it is clear
 how they are called (thus) - so also here the unity of
 πρόσωπον suffers no harm from the difference of natures.
 3. When we think about natures, we understand the
 divine nature

אִי כִּי בָּרַךְ הָיָה לְפָנֵינוּ וְלִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים
 2. And just as it does not harm the number of the two there
 that the flesh should be called "one" - for it is clear in
 what (way)⁴
 "one" is said, the unity of
 πρόσωπον does not detract
 from the difference of natures.

אִי כִּי בָּרַךְ הָיָה לְפָנֵינוּ וְלִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים
 3. For when we distinguish the natures, we say that the
 nature of the God

פֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט אַלל, און, לויטן
מֶלֶךְ אֱלֹהִים פֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט
אפֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט אַלל. אפֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט
בִּרְמִיזָה.

און, ווען מיר זען דאָס
פֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט אַלל.

אפֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט, אַלל: אַלל
פֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט. אַלל אַלל
דאָס. אַלל אַלל אַלל
לויטן, אַלל, אַלל.

מֶלֶךְ אֱלֹהִים, אַלל, אַלל
פֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט אַלל.

און, אַלל, אַלל, אַלל, אַלל.

אפֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט אַלל, אַלל
פֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט אַלל, אַלל
בִּרְמִיזָה.

Logos is perfect and *πρόσωπον*
is complete - for one cannot
say *hypostasis* without
πρόσωπον - but so is the
nature of man, and⁵ so is
πρόσωπον.

4. But if we look at the
connection, then we say a
*πρόσωπον*⁶.

5. In man, too, we say, if we
distinguish the natures, one
nature of the soul and another
of the body, a hypostasis for
this and a hypostasis for that.

6. So we recognize that they
are differentiated, that if

the soul separates itself from
the body, it is in ^{itself}⁷ and
remains in its own *πρόσωπον*.

7. And that is why it is said of
each of them that, in the way
of nature

in its hypostasis a n d human
nature.

4. But if we look at the
connection, then we say a
πρόσωπον and a *hypostasis*.

5. For when we distinguish the
nature of man, we say one
nature of the soul and another
of the body, knowing that each
of them has hypostasis *and*
nature.

6. And we are convinced that
when the soul is separated
from the body

is separated, (it) *remains* in its
nature and in its hypostasis.

7. And each of them has
nature and hypostasis.

און, אַלל, אַלל, אַלל, אַלל.
פֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט אַלל, אַלל, אַלל.

אפֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט, אַלל, אַלל, אַלל
פֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט אַלל, אַלל, אַלל
דאָס. אַלל אַלל אַלל
לויטן, אַלל, אַלל, אַלל.

מֶלֶךְ אֱלֹהִים, אַלל, אַלל, אַלל
פֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט אַלל, אַלל, אַלל.

אפֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט אַלל, אַלל
פֿאַרפֿאַרמאָגט אַלל, אַלל, אַלל.

קדוּשָׁה וְיִשְׁרָאֵל. אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
בְּעֵדוּתוֹת קְדוּשָׁה וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.

קְדוּשָׁה וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
לְקַדְּשׁוֹת וְיִשְׁרָאֵל: וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל, אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.

אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.

אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.

11. For the natures are different, but the one *πρόσωπον* proves itself in the union.

12. So here, too, when we endeavor to bring the natures we say that

perfect is the *πρόσωπον* of man, but perfect is also that of the Godhead.

13. But if we look at the unification, then we proclaim that both natures are one *πρόσωπον*, in that *at the same time*¹¹ humanity with the deity receives honor from the

all creation, ^{and12} the Godhead accomplishes all *that is necessary* in it.

11. And in that [the natures are recognized]^[*****], it is a *πρόσωπον* of union.

12 [And thus]^[*****], if we want to understand the natures[:] Let us say[,] that full-

If man is perfect in his *hypostasis*, let us say that [God is also perfect (sc. in his *hypostasis*)]^[*****].

(13) But if we want to understand the union, we proclaim the two natures as one *πρόσωπον* and one *hypostasis*, knowing that *because of the unity* of God, the two natures are one.

humanity receives honor from creation and the deity does everything in it.

אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.

אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.

אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.

אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.
אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲנִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל.

... וְיִשְׁרָאֵל

In his translation p. 43 f. Sachau sets the existing Leontius pieces [fragmentum Leontii 6 (p. 466,5-15 ed. Daley); Jansen frg. XII (p. 244,5-16); fragmentum Leontii 7 (p. 466,17-468,6 ed. Daley); Jansen frg. XIII (p. 245,2-10) - ed.

Richard has a Greek retranslation, plus the corrections by Köbert.

¹ missing in gr.

² eigtl. "about the of" - did the translator read ἐπὶ τὰ τοῦ instead of ἐπὶ τοῦ[?]

³ not Peš.

⁴ presupposes Greek ἢ

⁵ ܐܠܐ

⁶ here ends the first parallel Leontius piece [the remark is missing in the typescript (*h*), where a larger *spatium* indicates that a Syriac phrase was intended for insertion; on this passage hsl. *i.m.*:] here parallel in 1466[9, see Appendix 1 below. The Leontius piece meant by L. A. is fragmentum Leontii 6 (p. 466,5-15 ed. Daley); Jansen frg. XII (p. 244,4-16) - *ed.*]

⁷ ܡܕܝܬܐ (in itself - Köbert)

⁸ ms. ܡܕܝܬܐܐܝܬܐ I think this is wrongly assimilated

⁹ Here the Greek parallel begins again [fragmentum Leontii (p. 466,17-468,6 ed. Daley); Jansen frg. XIII (p. 245,2-10), see Appendix 1 below - *ed.*]

¹⁰ οὐσία

¹¹ ܡܕܝܬܐܐܝܬܐ, missing in Greek

¹² ܐܠܐ for καὶ

[[†]] [For the alternative Syriac version given in the typescript on the following page from add. 14669 (Sachau p. ܐܠ. 2 - ܐܠ. 10), the number **16'** is introduced for better differentiation. The line count introduced by L. A. to compare the two versions in her translations, which show the character of the alternative version particularly clearly, had to be abandoned with a heavy heart. Instead, based on the syntactic features of L. A.'s translation of **16**, a sentence count is introduced which is based on **16'** (as well as the Syriac parallel given in Appendix 1) - *ed.*]

[^{†*}] [see the previous note. The typographical arrangement of the Syriac text follows *mutatis mutandis* the guidelines of the 'editor's note' to this contribution. A third tradition bearer (Theodor bar Koni) has been compared in Appendix 1 - *ed.*]

[^{†***}] [To be added after the Syriac - *the ed.*]

[^{†****}] [In accordance with the grammar of the context as well as the Syriac parallel in Appendix 1, L. A. reads ܡܕܝܬܐܐܝܬܐ, according to her translation and translates accordingly "by recognizing the natures". The text edited by Sachau offers - in exact agreement with the Greek parallel (διακεκρμέναι [γὰρ αἱ φύσεις]) - at this point ܡܕܝܬܐܐܝܬܐ and the translation given above is corrected accordingly - *ed.*]

[^{†*****}] [L. A. translates "And herein"; it is to be considered against the background of the Greek parallel given in Appendix 1 whether by the component ܡܕܝܬܐܐܝܬܐ is not to be rendered ὥστε πάντα ὕθα, thus "And thus (results)" is to be understood; the punctuation is carefully changed to this effect - *d. Editor*]

[^{†*****}] The reading of the manuscript version (*g*) ("this also is perfect God") is contrasted in the typescript (*h*) with a reading which (because of the confusion of "a" and "d") can easily be explained by reading ("through this perfect God is"); the understanding of the text proposed in the plain text is probably preferable (not least because of the *parallelismus membrorum*), the Syriac parallel in Appendix 1 has a simpler text - *ed.*]

17 f. 85r col. 3-85v col. 1 (Lagarde p. 105,25-28)

ܡܢ ܕܡܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ

From chapter 66, i.e. also from the evidence presented and from the sequence of what has been said, it is proven that as

"Man" is not the God Logos with whom flesh can be worshipped, but man is a living being like others.¹

Sachau p. 67 - Without parallel tradition.

¹ "like others" is my rendering of ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ. These two Syriac words are used to render Greek *ποῖος*, which makes no sense here unless the text has been deliberately falsified. It can be assumed that in the Greek. *ποῖος* stood for "any one". R. Abramowski corrected hsl. Sachaus "*ut hoc (!)*" into *quoddam*.

18 f. 85v col.1 (Lagarde p. 105,28-106,3)

וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הָעָם
 אֶת-הַקּוֹל וְיִשְׁמַע
 אֶת-הַקּוֹל וְיִשְׁמַע
 אֶת-הַקּוֹל וְיִשְׁמַע
 אֶת-הַקּוֹל וְיִשְׁמַע
 אֶת-הַקּוֹל וְיִשְׁמַע

אֶת-הַקּוֹל וְיִשְׁמַע
 אֶת-הַקּוֹל וְיִשְׁמַע
 אֶת-הַקּוֹל וְיִשְׁמַע
 אֶת-הַקּוֹל וְיִשְׁמַע

And again. Therefore those who speak
 very foolishly are rebuked from
 everywhere. For under the name
 "Man" is not the Logos with the flesh
 [recognized]. It is clear, however, that
 the Scriptures, by constantly referring
 to

The fact that the term "man" is
 mentioned in reference to Christ
 indicates this nature of man, which was
 assumed by him as complete for our
 redemption, the nature of which
 Scripture is accustomed to call by this
 term.

Sachau p. 67 f. - Without parallel tradition

¹In Richard p. 73 erroneously labeled LXXI.

²add. 14669 + "with the father"

³"vollzogen" is missing in add. 14669.

[¹] [The parallel from add. 14669 (ed. Sachau) has been inserted according to the simile apparatus from the synopsis mentioned at the beginning (*e*) and - following the example of **16'** (see there) - has been given the number **19'**; L. A. has dispensed with a citation for the later preliminary stages including the typescript [cf. in this volume pp. 37 f.]. The typographical arrangement of the Syriac text follows *mutatis mutandis* the guidelines of the 'editor's note' to this contribution - *ed.*]

¹add. 14669 (Sachau): "Barmherziger oder Barmherzigkeit Empfangender".

²"out of which - is accomplished": add. 14669 "which receives worship from all creation"

[¹] [The parallel from add. 14669 (ed. Sachau) has been inserted according to the simile apparatus from the synopsis mentioned at the beginning (e) and - following the example of **16'** (see there) - has been given the number **20'** - *ed.*]

23 f. 85v col. 2 (Lagarde p. 106,21-24)

ܐܬܪܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ
 ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ
 ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ
 ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ
 ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ

And after another. "For it was fitting for him through whom all things and for whose sake all ^{things}¹ (are)" - [it is clear that he is speaking of the God Logos - "and who brought many sons to glory", those whom he deemed worthy of adoption as sons, "that he should perfect the head of their ^{lives}¹ through suffering" (Heb. 2:10), - he is speaking of the man who was adopted by him]^[1]

Sachau p. 68 - Without parallel tradition in exactly this form, but cf. Swete II, p. 303,10-14 [Greek = fragmentum Leontii 14 (p. 472,14-17 ed. Daley); Jansen frg. XXIV (p. 250,4-6); lat. Swete II, p. 303,9-13 = ACO IV,1 p. 62,3-5] and within a longer fragment on Heb. 2,9-10 from the Greek Catechism (Staab, Pauluskommentare p. 204), the second half of which is entirely *Christological*, the following lines:

Staab p. 204, 36-205,1 ἔπρεπε γὰρ αὐτῷ, δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα- δηλονότι τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ λέγων ἐπειδήπερ πολλοῖς τῆς υἰότητος μετέδωκεν καὶ εἰς τὴν δόξαν ἤγαγεν ταύτην, τὸν τῆς ἀπάντων σωτηρίας ἀρχηγόν, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν, τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ ληφθέντα ἅνθρωπον διὰ τῶν παθημάτων τέλειον ἀποφῆναι.

¹ The biblical text corresponds exactly to the Pešitta, hence the deviations in the order of the prepositions (they are in reverse order in the Greek NT) and the type of translation of "Leader of their salvation".

^[1] [Since the Syriac lacks an equivalent for the ἐπειδήπερ of the Greek Catena tradition, it should be considered whether the Syriac translator has not constructed the second part of the statement - in contrast to the *Greek*, where the construction of the sentence is continued differently - also dependent on λέγων: ἡ ܐܬܪܐ is taken up again at the very end. For what is placed in square brackets, the following understanding of the text would then have to be applied: "it is clear that he (here) means the God Logos - and (by) 'who led many sons to glory', those whom he considered worthy of being accepted as sons, 'that he perfected the head of their life through suffering' (Heb. 2:10), (it is clear that he means) the man who was accepted by him" - *ed.*]

24 f. 85v col. 2-3 (Lagarde p. 106,24-27)

ܐܬܪܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ
 ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ
 ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ

And according to others. It is therefore also sufficiently proven from this that the Son God (is) for himself alone. He is called "man" (on the other hand) who was adopted by the God Logos.

Sachau p. 68 - Without parallel tradition.

30 f. 86r col. 2 (Lagarde p. 108,1-6)

מִן הַיָּמִים הַהֵם וְעַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה
 אֲנִי מְבַרְכֶּךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
 מִן הַיָּמִים הַהֵם

וְעַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה קָבַלְתָּ אֶת
 הַיָּמִים הַהֵם וְעַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה

אֲנִי מְבַרְכֶּךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
 מִן הַיָּמִים הַהֵם וְעַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה

וְעַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה אֲנִי מְבַרְכֶּךָ

✠

From the explanation of the letter to the Hebrews. Who is it that enters into the world circle

and receive dominion over him, from whence also it came to pass that he was worshipped by the angels (cf.

Heb 1:6)? Not even if someone is ver- he would say that it is the God Logos who enters, he who made everything that does not exist and gave it to be through his inexpressible power.

Sachau p. 70.

30 [=] Swete p. 305,¹⁶⁻²⁴¹ (exceptionally with reference to Lagarde) = ACO IV 1 p. 81,5-8 "*post alia*", from Cyril's writing against Theodore. The editors do not refer to the parallel in add. 12156, because this quotation does not appear in Richard's list. Accordingly, the text is also missing in my 1987 list.

¹ to *De incarnatione*, with individual quotations in Swete the attributions are confused (because *De incarnatione* also deals with the Pauline texts from Heb.)

31 f. 86 r col. 2-3 (Lagarde p. 108,7-12)

קאקוֹדאָלֹה אַלִּי דַּבֵּרִי [וְ:אֵלֶּיךָ
אֵלֶּיךָ דַּבֵּרִי הֵן מִן דִּבְרֵי מַלְאָכָא כְּדֵי
דְּמַסְרֵיהּ אֲבִיךָ. מִן דִּבְרֵי מַלְאָכָא.

דאָ קאָקאָלֹה קִי כִּלְקֵי קִי. אֵלֶּיךָ, דְּמִן
דְּכִי, דְּמִן אֲבִיךָ דִּבְרֵי מַלְאָכָא מִן דִּבְרֵי
אֲבִיךָ. אֲבִיךָ, אֲבִיךָ אֲבִיךָ. אֲבִיךָ, אֲבִיךָ
אֲבִיךָ. אֲבִיךָ, אֲבִיךָ. אֲבִיךָ, אֲבִיךָ.

דאָ קאָקאָלֹה קִי

From the speech to those to be ^{baptized}¹. "Jesus namely," he says, "of Nazareth, whom God endowed with the ^{Holy}² Spirit and with the anointed with power" (Acta 10:38), who, being worthy of the anointing, was blameless (Heb 9:14) in all things.

was ^{perfect}³, for he said that

He, "who through the eternal Spirit offered himself blamelessly to God" (Heb 9:14)⁴, was also honored with the union with the divine nature. Nor would he have received this union if he had not first been perfect without ^{blame}⁵.

Sachau p. 68 f.

31 [=] Swete p. 326,1-4; exceptionally with reference to Lagarde. ACO IV 1 p. 60, 1-4, lemma: *item eiusdem ex eodem libro* (sc. *ad baptizandos*) no. XXXVIII 47; = Vig. Const. 39 (without lemma) Coll. Avell.

p. 269,26-270,3. Translation in Innocent of Maronea ACO IV 2 p. 72,1-5; this version has the final colon in common with the others, but like the Syriac has the complete text.

The reference to add. 12156 is missing in the app. of ACO IV 1 because Richard had not listed citations **24 ff.**; accordingly, the parallel is also missing in my list.

R. Abramowski hsl.⁶ and the app. in ACO IV 1 refer to a quotation from the Declaration of Hebrews (No. XXXI 39) which begins with the same biblical quotation. In the catechet. Speeches of Theodore, the fragment has not been found either by R. Abr. ("*unde*") or by the editors of ACO IV 1.

¹ The lemma was probably mixed up; the text perhaps still belongs in the explanation of Hebrews; the next quotation comes from the baptismal speeches.

² missing in the Latin parallels of the Acts of the Council and of Vigilius, present in Innocent of Maronea

³ Here follow in the Hs. 3 ½ exponentiated lines (dittography [scil. of the words קִי אֲבִיךָ קִי אֲבִיךָ ed.]), which Lagarde has therefore omitted.

⁴ "he said namely - offered to God" is missing in the Latin parallels (homoiototeuton ἁμωμον?) of Con- cil and Vigilius, but present in Innocent of M.

⁵ The lat. Parallels continue: "*ut sic condeceat illius unitatem*" (Conc., Vig.); Innocent of Maronea: "*ut ita per eius claresceret unitatem*".

⁶ see also essay ZNW [33,] 1934, [66-84].

The Syriac translation of the Catechetical Discourses, unlike the one in add. 12156 in the tradition that was not only friendly to Theodore, but also held him in high esteem. What does this say about the reliability of the rendering of the Greek text? My impression is that it is the same Greek text, only the translation in the catecheses is much smoother. Of the marked differences, "put on" for "receive" is a Syriacization; "indwell" for "was in him" is the insertion of the popular Antiochian vocabulary; the addition "revealing" is characteristic of Nestorian theology. "Jesus" for "who was" is a lightening and smoothing by the more common.

In short: 12156 has probably better preserved the peculiarities of Theodor's ^{text}¹.

¹ Cf. what R. Abramowski says in ZNW [33,] 1934, [66-84,] about the relation of the Syriac translation to the fragments handed down by Swete: he is of the opinion that the Syriac translation offers the better text compared to the bumpy Latin. But what if it is also a matter of smoothing? [L. A. has reconsidered her views on this, cf. in this volume p. 26 - *ed.*]

¹ Korr, "par son vêtement"

[The Syriac text has been inserted according to the insert mentioned at the beginning, preserved between p. 35 and 36 of the manuscript version (*g*), the diacritical dots have been added according to the facsimile of the manuscript (ed. Tonneau / Devreesse). The manuscript corrigendum in square brackets (see the comments on pp. 29-36 in this volume) has been emended according to L. A.'s suggestion (cf. also n. 1 of the left-hand column). A German translation has meanwhile been published

P. Bruns in volume 17 of the series "Fontes Christiani" (Theodor von Mopsuestia, Katechetische Homilien, Freiburg 1994); Bruns translates: "This, it says, we understand as the one Lord, who is of that divine nature of God the Father, who for the sake of our salvation put on a man and dwelt in him and through him [*em. Abramowski*: through his garment] became manifest and recognizable to all men: This is the man who is to be called Jesus according to the word of the angel. He was anointed with the Holy Spirit and was perfected and justified in him according to the testimony of the blessed Paul (cf. Acts 10:38; 1 Tim. 3:16; Heb. 2:9 f)." - *ed.*]

33 f. 86r col. 3 (Lagarde p. 108, 19-24)

[illegible][illegible]

From the Matthew commentary. But because the time of the expected fulfillment had come for him, he took and sent to the salvation event for our sake the one he made from us and for our sake, whom he also proved to be in the rank of Son through his union with the God Logos. [This, - being born of a woman, because he was to become man, (he) is by nature (what) is fitting, - (this) he put under the ^[law1]] ^[*]

Sachau p. 69 f.

Without parallel tradition; also not to be found in Reuß, Matthäus-Kommentare.

¹The entire fragment is a characteristic paraphrase of Gal 4:4.

[1] [L. A., in the course of her struggle for the correct understanding of this tricky passage, fixed a different solution in writing at each stage of the text: P. Köbert had suggested the following translation in his typewritten *concept* (a): "whom, because he was born of woman and by nature should be man, he rightly subjected to the law". L. A. improved this paraphrase in her copy by hand to the following rough translation (b): "who, being born of woman, because he was to become man, is (it) by nature; therefore it is fitting that he should make himself to be under the law." In the next comprehensible textual stage, the manuscript version (g), it now initially read: "This one, - in that he was born of a woman, ~~so that~~-because he was to become man, (~~it is~~-he) by nature, (what) befits, - he did under the law." L. A. noted *in margine* "Syntax?" and corrected the wording *in calce* once again. The corrected form then found its way into the typescript (h) and is printed here. - The greatest difficulty is caused by the word written in add. 12156 without vowel points, which is to be understood either as a substantive (meaning "his servant" or "his doing" / "his deed"), or as a finite verb form ("[he] made him" / "[he] did him"). The well-known arbitrariness in the placement of punctuation marks in Syriac manuscripts does the rest. If there is no textual corruption at all, several translations are possible in terms of language (or content?) - none of which, however, seems to be entirely unproblematic: "to whom, when he was born of a woman, that he should become man according to nature, it was fitting, under the law, that he should become his servant." Or: "when he was born of a woman, since it was fitting that he should become man according to nature - under the law, so that it might come to pass (= be fulfilled *or similar*), he did it." - *ed.*]

[Appendix 1:] within the famous passage from Book VIII^[*]

[frg. Leontii 6 (p. 466,2-15 ed. Daley) = frg. XII Jansen (p. 244,4-16) =] Swete 299,1-26

(Sachau p. ۱۰۷, [l.]19-۲۰, [l.] 16.23-25)

Theod[or] Bar Konai, Book of Scholia IX 3 ed. Scher, trad. Hespel/ Draguet (Indices de Halleux),

CSCO 69 (Syr. 26) p. 190, (12) 13-25 textus [with modifications - *the editor*].

CSCO 432 (Syr. 188) p. 141, 9-20 versio [with modifications - *the editor*] ^[**]

ܠܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ

Et dans le *Mimrā* ^{viii} de l'incorporation il dit:

Πανταχόθεν ἄρα δῆλον ὡς περιττὸν μὲν τὸ τῆς κράσεως καὶ ἀπρεπὲς καὶ ἀφαρμόζον, ἐκάστης τῶν φύσεων ἀδιαλύτως ἐφ' ἑαυτῆς μεινάσης. πρόδηλον δὲ ὡς τὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως ἐφαρμόζον- διὰ γὰρ ταύτης συναχθεῖσαι αἱ φύσεις ἔνν πρόσωπον κατὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν ἀπετέλεσαν-

ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ

[16'.1-2]

ὥς τε ὅπερ ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τε τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς φησιν- ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶ δύο, ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία, εἵπομεν ἂν καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰκότως κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐνώσεως λόγον, ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶ δύο πρόσωπα ἀλλ' ἓν, δηλονότι τῶν

ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ

ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ

φύσεων διακεκριμένων- ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖ οὐ λυμαίνεται τῷ ἀριθμῷ τῆς δυάδος τὸ μίαν λέγεσθαι τὴν σάρκα, πρόδηλον γὰρ καθ' ὃ μία λέγονται- οὕτω κάνταῦθα οὐ λυμαίνεται τῇ τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾷ τοῦ προσώπου ἢ ἔνωσις.

ܟܝܠܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ

[16'.3-4]

ὅταν μὲν γὰρ τὰς φύσεις διακρίνωμεν, τελείαν τὴν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου φαμέν, καὶ τέλειον τὸ πρόσωπον- οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπρόσωπον ἔστιν ὑπόστασιν εἰπεῖν- τελείαν δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσιν, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ὁμοίως- ὅταν μέντοι ἐπὶ τὴν συνάφειαν ἀπιδώμεν, ἓν πρόσωπον τότε φαμέν.

ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ

ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ

"Quand nous pensons au sujet des natures, nous comprenons la nature divine en son hypostase et la nature humaine en son hypostase; mais quand nous regardons la jonction, nous disons une personne et une hypostase.

Follows a piece that is only contained in the Syriac versions: second comparison: unity of body and soul [i.e. 16'.5-7]; 3rd comparison: inner man and outer man [i.e. 16'.8-9 - the editor].

[16'.5]

ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ

ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ

De même en effet que, lorsque nous séparons la nature de

האדם והטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע

האדם והטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע

l'homme, nous disons qu'autre
 est la nature du corps et autre
 (celle) de l'âme tout en disant
 que chacune d'elles a nature et
 hypostase,

...[
 [16'.10a]

אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע

אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע

mais que, [lorsqu']elles sont
 jointes en une seule, nous leur
 attribuons une seule hypostase
 et une seule personne et
 nommons les deux en un,

[frg. Leontii 7 (p. 466,17-468,6
 ed. Daley) = frg. XIII Jansen (p.
 245,2-10) =] Swete 300,3-10
 (repeating the content of the
 above!)

(Sachau p. 1, [I.] 25- 10].
 10]), [16'.10b-13]

[Text partially supplemented
 from the apparatus,] Scher n.
 8[***]

τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον κάνταῦθα
 ἰδίαν φαμέν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου
 τὴν οὐσίαν, ἰδίαν καὶ τὴν τοῦ
 ἀνθρώπου- διακεκριμέναι γὰρ
 αἱ φύσεις, ἐν δὲ τὸ πρόσωπον
 τῆ
 ἄποτελούμενον-

אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע

אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע

de la même façon nous disons ici
 aussi la nature divine et la
 nature humaine, et bien que
 [nous comprenions d]es
 natures, il est une seule
 personne d'union. Et en cette
 matière, lorsque nous

ὥστε κάνταῦθα ὅταν μὲν τὰς
 φύσεις διακρίνειν πειρώμεθα,
 τέλειον τὸ πρόσωπον φαμέν
 εἶναι τὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τέλειον
 δὲ καὶ τὸ τῆς θεότητος.

אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע

אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע
 אדם וטבע: אדם וטבע

voulons faire comprendre les
 natures, nous disons que parfait
 est l'homme en son hypostase
 et parfait le Dieu Verbe en son
 hypostase,

[^[1]] [Compiled from two comparisons of the synopsis (e) and checked on the basis of the edd. by Jansen, Sachau and Scher, the Urmiah recension from the book of scholia of Theodor bar Koni (ed. / trad. Hespel, CSCO 447/447, *Scriptores Syri* 193/194) and also the appendices of Silvanus of Qardu (ed. / trad. Hespel, CSCO 464/465, *Scriptores Syri* 197/198) were compared. Apart from the introductory section, the text of the Syriac column is already printed as **16'** alongside the Greek. The page and line numbers used by L. A. according to Sachau's edition have been supplemented at the appropriate place by the sentence numbering introduced in **16'** (see there) - *ed.*]

[^[2]]: The French. translation by Hespel/Draguet has been corrected according to L. A.'s manuscript copy, where L. A. corrected the translation of ܡܢ ܕܢܚܝܬܐ with *personne* and that of ܡܢ ܕܢܚܝܬܐ with *personnage* (in hypostase and *personne*). Other minor handwritten suggestions for improvement were also taken into account.

[^[3]] [At this point, the text is constituted on the basis of both Scher's edition and the variant in Scher's n. 8. In n. 13 of the translation, Hespel/Draguet refers to the text from Schers n. 8 as *une variante, de l'autorité de laquelle il est difficile de{s} juger* (see also p. 35 in this volume) - but it is clear from the parallel ad. 14669 that there is a gap in some manuscripts, since in part of the tradition the beginning of the sentence was probably already difficult to decipher - *ed.*]

[^[4]***] For the last half-sentence **16'**.13b (from add. 14669) there is no equivalent in Theodor bar Koni - *ed.*]

[Appendix 2:] Leontius, from Book XIII^[*]

[Appendix 3: Synopsis of the Syriac and Greek traditions]

Syrian = Abramowski frg.	Jansen frg.	Location for parallel tradition frg.
1	frg. I (p. 233,7-10)	ACO IV,1, p. 55,6-10
frg. 2-10	without parallel tradition	
frg. 11frg	. VII (p. 240,5-12)	frg. Leontii 2 (p. 458,11-18 ed. Daley)
frg. 12	frg. VII (p. 241,47-51)	frg. Leontii 2 (p. 460,24-27 ed. Daley)
frg. 13	frg. VIII (p. 242,9-17)	frg. Leontii 3 (p. 462,17-26 ed. Daley)
frg. 14	frg. IX (p. 242 f.,2-5)	frg. Leontii 4 (p. 464,2-4 ed. Daley)
frg. 15	without parallel tradition	
frg. 16 sentence 1-4	frg. XII (p. 244,5-16)	frg. Leontii 6 (p. 466,5-15 ed. Daley)
frg. 16 sentence 5	syr. parallel Theodor bar Koni IX 3	CSCO 69 (Syr. 26) p. 190,16-19
frg. 16 sentence 6-9	without parallel tradition	
frg. 16 sentence 10a-13a	syr. parallel Theodor bar Koni IX 3	CSCO 69 (Syr. 26) p. 190,19-25
frg. 16 sentence 10b-13frg	. XIII (p. 245,2-10)	frg. Leontii 7 (p. 466,17-468,6 ed. Daley)
frg. 17-18	without parallel tradition	
frg. 19	belongs factually to frg. XIX-XXI	
frg. 20	cf. frg. XXII (p. 249,1-5)	ACO IV,1, p. 180,1-5
frg. 21-22	without parallel tradition	
frg. 23cf	. frg. XXIV (p.250,4-6)	frg. Leontii 14 (p. 472,14-17 ed. Daley)
frg. 24	without parallel tradition	
frg. 25a	missing in Jansen, only Swete	Ephesus ACO I,1,7, p. 98,27-99,4
frg. 25b	missing in Jansen, only Swete	Ephesus ACO I,1,7, p. 99,10-13
frg. 26	without parallel tradition	
frg. 27	missing in Jansen	ACO IV,1. p. 60,8-12
frg. 28-29	without parallel tradition	
frg. 30	missing in Jansen, only Swete	ACO IV,1, p. 81,2-4
frg. 31	missing in Jansen, only Swete	ACO IV,1, p. 60,1-4
frg. 32	syr. parallel cat. Hom. III,5	Studi e testi 145, fol. 15v, lines 18-24 (p. 58,18-24 Tonneau/Devreesse)
frg. 33	without parallel tradition	
app. 2: end of cap. 78 (from add. 14669, missing in add. 12156)	frg. XXXIII (p. 253,2-254,6)	frg. Leontii 21 (p. 478,9-13 ed. Daley)

2 Babai the Great

2.1 The Christology of Babai the Great¹

I.

Of the many writings written by Babai the Great, only a few have survived. For Christology these are: the systematic monograph "De unione"² (the title in Ebed-Jesu; in the scribe's introductory note the book is called "De divinitate et de humanitate et de persona unionis"³), the short Vatican treatise edited as an appendix to "De unione"⁴; an even shorter presentation of the central thesis of Nestorian Christology is contained in a recently published Cambridge manuscript⁵. It is generally believed that Babai had a considerable share in the authorship or was the author of the confession of the Persian bishops before the Great King Kosrau in 612, with which the two-hypostasis Christology became the official doctrine of the Persian church⁶. In the Vita of the martyr George, Babai describes the confrontation with the followers of Henana; the arguments he puts into the mouth of his hero are at least in the wording those of the author⁷. Occasional Christological statements can also be found in the thick Euagrius commentary⁸ (which is called the "short" one, [220] as there was an even more detailed one),

where Babai explains the Syriac Vulgate, i.e. the defused version, of the Centuries (s_i according to Guillaumont's distinction) and an appendix. Here we will turn to "De unione" and the Vatican treatise.

The literature on Babai is not very extensive. It only becomes truly productive when one does not immediately confront this theologian with the question: orthodox or heretical⁹. Scipioni, who addressed this in his monograph on the Liber Heraclidis

¹ Contributions to the discussion appear in the notes.

² Ed. A. VASCHALDE, CSCO 79. 80 (Script. Syri 34. 35), Louvain 1915.

³ Textus p. 1, 5-7 (versio p. 1, 4-7).

⁴ P. 291-307 (p. 235-247). Theme of Scripture: from the hypostatic unity of body and soul in man a hypostatic unity of the person of Christ cannot be derived.

⁵ Ed. L. ABRAMOWSKI/A. E. GOODMAN, *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts*, Cambridge 1972, I p. 207-209 (II p. 123-125). Theme: for the union of the two natures into one prosopon in Christ one needs two hypostases, because otherwise the *whole* divine nature and the *whole* humanity would be united into this one prosopon.

⁶ Ed. J. CHABOT, *Synodicon Orientale*, Paris 1902, p. 562-580 (p. 580-598); incomplete, with sometimes slightly better text, Abramowski/Goodman p. 150-169 (p. 88-101).

⁷ The relevant parts of the Vita in translation conveniently compiled by CHABOT, p. 625- 634.

⁸ Ed. W. FRANKENBERG, *Euagrius Ponticus*. Abh. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, phil. hist. Kl., NF XIII 2, Berlin 1912.

⁹ Thus W. DE VRIES, *Die syrisch-nestorianische Haltung zu Chalcedon*, in: *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, ed. A. GRILLMEIER/H. BACHT, I, Würzburg 1951, p. 603-635.

for Nestorius¹⁰, was thus able to make an important contribution to the understanding of the Bishop of Constantinople's Christology. He takes the same attitude towards Babai, with the same success; he uses Babai for comparison with Nestorius and for mutual explanation, because Babai knows and uses the Liber Heraclidis (but does not name it!)¹¹. Scipioni, of course, still regards the entire Liber Heraclidis as the work of Nestorius (as Babai does, of course) and must therefore sometimes be corrected. Since Scipioni does not mention his Babai investigations in the title of his Nestorius book, his contribution has escaped the attention of the authors who have yet to be named and who have dealt with Babai. Thus Adam in his history of dogma¹², in which Babai's teaching takes on an even too archaic appearance. Wanda Wolska, in her comprehensive treatment of the "Christian Topography" of Kosmas Indikopleustes¹³ the influence of "Theodoric" and Nisibene theology on Kosmas. Her book, whose qualities in the history of science and the history of theology I have already praised on an earlier [221] occasion¹⁴, contains as Appendix II a comparison of the theology of the "Christian Topography" and the Nestorian doctrine of Babai the Great¹⁵. On the basis of many similarities, the author must conclude that Babai had a much more developed terminology and that he developed what had only just been laid out in Cosmas and the sources he used. This is too one-sided a view; one of the reasons for Babai's more differentiated terminology is precisely his use of the Liber Heraclidis, i.e. a writing of Antiochian theology that is older than the writings and thoughts of Nisibene theology used by Cosmas. It is important to bear in mind the many individual forms and possible manifestations of Antiochian theology and Christology and the associated individual traditions. It is to Wanda Wolska's great credit that she has traced the line leading from Theodor of Mopsuestia to Kosmas Indikopleustes. With his characteristic competence, Guillaumont Babai's writings

¹⁰ L. I. SCIPIONI, *Ricerche sulla cristologia del 'Libro di Eraclide' di Nestorio*, Fribourg 1956, p. 13.

¹¹ On the very modest *external* attestation of the Liber Heraclidis among the Syrians, see L. ABRA-MOWSKI, *Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius*, CSCO 242 (Subs. 22), Louvain 1963, p. 4 ff. Bar'Edta (ibid. p. 6 f.), who memorized the Lib. Her. by heart, significantly belonged to the "Great Monastery" of Abraham of Kaškar; in 561 he himself founded a monastery on behalf of Abraham, of which he became the head. Babai himself was abbot of the "great monastery", "De unione" is addressed to the brothers of this monastery, one of whom was a relative of Abraham ("De unione", versio p. 2). - Used, but not mentioned by the authors, the lib. Her. is also found in the "Nestorian Collection".

¹² A. ADAM, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* I, Gütersloh 1965, p. 344-347.

¹³ W. WOLSKA, *La Topographie chrétienne du Cosmas Indicopleustès. Théologie et Science au ^{VI}e siècle*, Paris 1962.

¹⁴ *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengeschichte* 76 (1965), p. 164 f.

¹⁵ Op. cit. p. 288-292.

for his study of the history of Origenism¹⁶, the best contribution since Scipioni (who was not consulted by Guillaumont) to the knowledge of "De unione". Equally important for the history of "Nestorian" Christology in the strictest sense is Guillaumont's edition of a New Chalcedonian-Nestorian disputation between Emperor Justinian and Bishop Paul of Nisibis, including G.'s introduction¹⁷. The editor dates this disputation with good reason to 562 or 563¹⁸; it seems so important to him because here a member of the hierarchy *before* 612 advocates the doctrine of the two Christological hypostases.

I am now of the opinion that the need to come to terms with the neo-Chalcedonian hypostasis synthetos led the Persian Dyophysites to develop the two-hypostasis Christology. From 539/40, the [222] Syriac translation of the Liber Heraclidis was available to them as a theological basis for this¹⁹. As the Synodal Creeds testify, this did not mean that the simpler and older form of Antiochian Christology was immediately suppressed, where one was content with the formula of two natures and one prosopon. However, when within the Persian church itself, namely through the influential figure of ʿHenana, a supplement to the two-nature Christology was propagated by the doctrine of the one (composite) hypostasis, it became too dangerous to leave the choice open between the formula "two natures - one prosopon" and its further development "two natures - two hypostases - one prosopon"; simpler minds were obviously not in a position to defend the older Antiochian formula against the ʿHenana interpretation without further qualifying, unambiguous additions. The decision of 612 stipulates that the traditional Christology may only be represented in the form interpreted by the two hypostases, after which there is no longer an option. The influence of ʿHenana and his disciples certainly had a long-lasting effect.

On this occasion, it does not seem superfluous to call for clear terminology. in the designation of the various Antiochian movements, especially for a precisely defined and limited use of "Nestorian".

¹⁶ A. GUILLAUMONT, *Les 'Kephalaia Gnostica' d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les grecs et les syriens*, Paris 1962.

¹⁷ A. GUILLAUMONT, *Justinien et l'église de Perse*, *Dumbarton Oak Papers* 23/24 (1969/70), p. 39-66 and photographs of the Syriac manuscript (translation: p. 62-66). - In the discussion, G. referred to this text as evidence for the appearance of the formula of the two hypostases *before* Babai and, in view of this, recalled the well-known fact that the synodal documents of the Persian Church before 612 do not contain the doctrine of the two hypostases.

¹⁸ P. 55.

¹⁹ In the discussion, Father Macomber said that Cyrus of Edessa could be the translator of the Liber Heraclidis into Syriac, that Cyrus belonged to the circle around the later Catholicos Mar Aba, and that there were similarities to Cyrus' phraseology in the translator's preface. - This would be a nice step forward in the limited knowledge we have of the transmission history of the Liber Heraclidis.

"Antiochian" is the most comprehensive term, but not every representative of Antiochian Christology is also "Nestorian". Above all, one should not (even unconsciously) take Cyril's Anathemata as the standard for what is to be considered Nestorian: those twelve sentences are also an extreme text in Cyril's writings, their intention is deliberately denunciatory; Theodoret's collections of quotations in the "Eranistes" show how broad the tradition is that is affected by the spell of the Anathemata. And the Monophysites were only consistent if, seen through the lens of the Cyrillic condemnatory sentences, the *Tomus Leonis* and the corresponding passages of the Chalcedonense appeared to them to be suspect or even heretical. Since it cannot therefore be a question of continuing the undifferentiated use of "Nestorian" as an insult^[223], an appropriate usage must be sought. The dyophysite church of Persia, "the holy church of the East" as it called itself²⁰, later used the derogatory word "Nestorian" to describe itself²¹, when the formulations of 612 had long since been established as orthodox. Nestorian would then be the confession of two natures in two hypostases in the one prosopon of Christ. Officially, then, the Church of Persia is Nestorian only from 612 onwards, before which it espoused different variants of Antiochian theology; the two-hypostasis Christology is a specialized variant among these. This naturally raises the question of whether Nestorius should be described as Nestorian. There is no doubt that Nestorius holds the view that the two natures in Christ result in two hypostases - but he only does this, as Richard has shown²², after he has received Cyril's Anathemata, where the conclusion (to be judged) is drawn from the Antiochian Christology advocated by Nestorius with sharp rhetorical means that Nestorius then *horribile dictu* teaches two hypostases in Christ (making Cyril the inventor of Nestorianism). The naivety of Nestorius can be judged by the fact that he allowed himself to be maneuvered into this position by the sophisticated Cyril; the Bishop of Constantinople was a man to whom the English adjectives "unworldly and saintly" can be applied, neither of which can be said of Cyril. The behavior of the two bishops after Ephesus in 431 shows this difference in character particularly clearly - one only has to imagine how differently the course of events would have unfolded if Nestorius had bribed his way to Constantinople, as Cyril did so successfully on his way back to Alexandria.

Remarkably, the term Nestorian in the sense given above is too narrow for the very individual form that Nestorius' Christology took in the Second Apology (i.e. the genuine part of the *Liber Heraclidis*). Grillmeier rightly emphasizes the importance of the Second Apology as one of the first theo-

²⁰ *Nestorian Collection* II, p. 36, 26 f.

²¹ *Ibid.* II, p. 3,7; 31,8.

²² M. RICHARD, *L'introduction du mot "Hypostase" dans la théologie de l'incarnation*, *Mél. sc. rel.* 2 (1945), p. 255-258.

retic treatises on Christology²³. [224] Nestorius endeavors here, under the established presuppositions of Antiochian Christology, to determine the origin of the one prosopon from the two natures. It is true that each of the natures has a hypostasis, but each of these hypostases also has a prosopon, and the unity of the one prosopon of Christ comes about from the prosopa of the two natures, in that one prosopon uses the other (this use is never intended to be interrupted)²⁴. Nestorius' interest lies entirely in these two prosopa and how their union is to be conceived - here lies the proprium of the fully developed Christology of the exiled bishop of Constantinople. This also reveals the difference to the Christology of Babai the Great. Although Babai also makes statements that assign a pro-sopon to every nature beyond the hypostasis (since he knows his Nestorius well), his interest lies in the *two hypostases*; what matters to him is how these two hypostases become one prosopon. This is a clear *shift in emphasis*, which can be explained by the changed situation in church history and dogma history in which the representatives of the strict Antiochian tradition found themselves. What matters now is the *confession* of two hypostases as a characteristic of orthodoxy. If the adjective "Nestorian" could be translated into other languages (which unfortunately is not the case), it would have to be used for Nestorius (and for Ps. Nestorius, the author of the dialog at the beginning of the Liber Heraclidis) in order to record his personal idiosyncrasy in comparison with the Nestorians (= representatives of a two-hypostasis Christology à tout prix). That a different path could also be taken from Nestorius' design than the one leading to Babai, where the two hypostases become the main thing, can be seen in Ps. Nestorius from the beginning of the Liber Heraclidis. What he develops on the basis of Nestorius' formula "two natures - two hypostases - two prosopa - one prosopon" is probably the most interesting variant and development of the basic Antiochian formula of two natures in one prosopon: "two natures - two prosopa - one prosopon". I.e. this Ps. Nestorius dispenses with the use of the term hypostasis for Christology altogether, with the exception of one inconspicuous passage where he speaks of *a* hypostasis, which seemed so improbable to Nau that he added a second hypostasis in his translation [225] (he considered the whole book to be genuine)²⁵. Nestorius thus avoids the embarrassment that the one Chalcedonian hypostasis often caused, especially among the Antiochians, in the simplest possible way by not using the term at all. He too obviously saw the scopus of Nestorius in the two prosopa and not in the two hypostases. We now know that Ps. Nestorius opposes Philoxenus; the opposing keywords include *henōsis*

²³ A. GRILLMEIER, *Das scandalum oecumenicum des Nestorius in kirchlich-dogmatischer und theiegeschichtlicher Sicht*, *Scholastik* 36 (1961), p. 354.

²⁴ ABRAMOWSKI, *Investigations*, p. 202 ff.

²⁵ ABRAMOWSKI, *Untersuchungen*, p. 161 f. and 184 f.

physikē and the synthesis physikē²⁶, but *not* (yet) the hypostasis synthetos - Ps. Nestorius would not have gotten away with his renunciation of the word "hypostasis". Unlike Ps. Nestorius, Babai wages a war on two fronts: against Philoxenus (the references to him can be felt at every turn in "De unione") and against the neo-Chalcedonian Christology of the one composite hypostasis together with its intra-Nestorian reception by Henana.

The theological achievement of Nestorius and Ps. Nestorius can be fully appreciated by comparing their reflections on the two natures, the two prosopa and the one prosopon of Christ with two passages in Theodore of Mopsuestia, which probably provided the starting point for the two-prosopa Christology. In VIII. Book VIII of "De incarnatione" reads: "When we distinguish the natures, we say the complete nature of the God Logos and completely the prosopon; one cannot speak of hypostasis without prosopon (aprosopon); but (we also say) the complete nature of man and also the prosopon; but if we look at the synapheia, then we say a prosopon." ²⁷ Something very similar a few lines later²⁸. With regard to the vocabulary "hypostasis" ²⁹ we have here Theodore's usual usage, namely the trinitarian one; it is no coincidence that the human nature of Christ is not automatically assigned a hypostasis by analogy (or by inference from prosopon to hypostasis in application of the principle that one cannot speak of hypostasis without prosopon). Theodor says nothing about the relation of the two prosopa to the one prosopon; for him it is a [226] distinction secundum quid whether one has to speak of two or of one prosopon. Nestorius and Ps. Nestorius, on the other hand, deal with this difficulty most impressively and try to really bring the two prosopa together, Nestorius through the "use", which Ps. Nestorius further specifies as mutual appropriation. Here, then, a genuine further development of theodoric formulae has taken place. However, Nestorius is *not* a "Theodorian" when viewed in the context of Theodore of Mopsuestia's theology as a whole. In Theodore, Antiochian Christology is embedded in a wealth of religious references, as in no other representative of the school, and there is hardly a trace of these references in Nestorius: neither of the doctrine of catastasis, nor of the doctrine of baptism or participation with their eschatological characteristics and their systematic connection with each other and with Christology.

To return to the history of the two-hypostasis Christology and its confrontation with the doctrine of the one composite hypostasis: if the dating of Leontius of Jerusalem is correct, then his writing

²⁶ In "Contra Monophysitas", Leontius of Jerusalem combats this as a representative of physis synthetos.

²⁷ SWETE II, p. 299,18-26 (a quotation from Leontius).

²⁸ Ibid. p. 300,4-8.

²⁹ "Hypostasis" *does not* appear p. 300,4-8.

"Contra Nestorianos" is the oldest evidence of this dispute to date. According to the Greek title, the treatise is directed against people who teach two hypostases of Christ and do not confess synthesis. Lib. I defends synthesis and contains endless expositions on the part and the whole, the circumscribed and the infinite; compare the correspondingly laborious passages in the "Nestorian Collection" ³⁰, in "De unione" and there also Babai's accusation against ʿHenana that he divides the infinite and indivisible Godhead into parts³¹; lib. II defends the hypostatic union; lib. III polemizes against the doctrine of the two sons; lib. IV: theotokos; lib. V: psilos anthropos; lib. VI: theophoros anthropos; lib. VII: unus ex trinitate passus est carne. There is the closest polemical relationship between this writing and the Nestorian texts, which still requires thorough investigation. When Moeller, in his classic essay on New Chalcedonianism³², ascribes "at least as much importance" to Leontius of Jerusalem³³ [227] as to the other Leontius³⁴, this must be underlined once again under these circumstances. However, one can no longer say, as Moeller does, that the Nestorianism opposed by Leontius is "entirely theoretical",³⁵ now that the opposing position is available to us in somewhat more recent writings, but in extenso. Formally, what they have in common is a preference "for logical discussions" ³⁶ (apart from Babai, his contemporaries ʿHenanišo the Monk and Michael Malpana also excel in this, see their texts in the "Nestorian Collection"); if "Contra Nestorianos", according to Moeller's judgment is "illegible" ³⁷, Nestorian theologians are often not much better. Leontius of Jerusalem has a special position among the New Chalcedonian theologians, which includes, among other things, that he is "very discreet" ³⁸ with regard to the Three Chapters and that he is quick to use the expression kyriakos anthropos³⁹, in which, as in other things, he has a successor in Pamphilus of Jerusalem⁴⁰. All this makes the theological origins of Leontius the Younger, the nature of his contacts with representatives of strict Antiochene theology (Greek and/or Syrian?) and his possible influence on ʿHenana very interesting questions.

30 Z. E.g. II p. 42 ff.

31 Versio p. 19; textus p. 109,7-10 (versio p. 77,15-17) "si pars cum toto composita est, quatenam est illa pars cum toto composita? Si pars dei cum toto homine, ecce impietas pagana ʿHenanae Chaldaei maledicti."

32 Ch. MOELLER, *Le chalcédonisme et le neo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du ^{vie} siècle*, in: *Chalcedon I*, p. 637-720.

33 On Leontius of Jerusalem *ibid.* p. 686 f. 693. 701 f.

34 *Ibid.* p. 687.

35 *Ibid.*

36 *Ibid.*

37 *Ibid.*

38 *Ibid.*

39 MOELLER, p. 693 n. 163, lists *ten* passages.

40 *Ibid.* p. 693.

II.

"De unione", as it has come down to us today (on what a narrow manuscript basis can be seen from Vaschalde's introduction), consists of seven books, *mēm̄rē*, which Vaschalde translates as tractatus. The books are again divided into chapters, but the chapters are numbered without regard to the division into books, c. 1-21; the chapter count ends with the 6th book. Book 7 contains no chapters, so it does not begin with a capitulum like the previous six, but with a lemma that attempts to give an idea of the content. Book 7 is not complete, the text breaks off [228] in a lengthy Eucharistic treatise; Vaschalde states: "Manus recentior in L addidit: 'In saeculum saeculorum. Amen. Explicit tractatus Mar Babai' coniectura ut videtur. - In cod. A amanuensis hanc clausulam adiecit: 'Explicit in adiutorio Domini nostri liber iste confessionis Nestorianorum, qui confitentur duas hypostases et duas naturas, et Spiritum de Patre procedere, compositus a Mar Babai.'" (A Gloria patri follows)⁴¹ Chabot, who compared the printed manuscript in London with L for Vaschalde, stated: "Desunt tamen in fine codicis saltem aliquot folia."⁴² If there were "some leaves", this is probably no more than the missing part of book 7; it is not necessary to conclude from Chabot's "at least" that what was lost could have been another (8th) book of "De unione".

The formal difference between Books 1-6 and Book 7, which at first seems minor, namely that Book 7 does not continue the chapter structure, is a useful pointer in the direction of further differences. The chapter divisions 1-21 are obviously authentic⁴³, and the chapter headings are not a later invention, as is often the case, since the text at the beginning of the chapters often presupposes these headings. In general, these 21 chapters (i.e. books 1-6) are a careful literary composition: chapters 1. 2. 3. 6. 8. 9. 11. 19. 20. 21 begin with introductory formulae, partly religious, partly literary; with the exception of the very short 14th chapter, all chapters have a concluding formula, generally a Gloria patri, c. 13 ends with an abridged version of Phil. 2, 8-11, and c. 15 has a literary concluding formula. The division into books, on the other hand, is secondary, but groups appropriately and respects the original division and numbering. I assume that the division into books took place when the present 7th book, which was not divided into chapters, was added to the 21 chapters. There is no question that Book 7 was also written by Babai, indeed he may have compiled 1-6 and 7 himself. Originally, however, Book 7 must have been an independent treatise. The lemma for Book 7 also considers it, among other things

⁴¹ Versio p. 233 n. 7, cf. textus p. 289 n. 1.

⁴² Textus p. III.

⁴³ The lemma of L speaks of "chapters" in which "De unione" is written, and not of *mēm̄rē*; textus p. 1,7 (versio p. 1,7).

as an epitome to the entire work, because some things are repeated in it. Book 7 [229] receives its internal structure from opposing statements, which are refuted one after the other; without any introduction, the book begins immediately with such a statement. In c. 1-21 the opponents and authors are mostly mentioned by name, but this does not happen in Book 7.

Vaschalde has thankfully provided the opposing sentences with quotation marks here, although he is not very consistent in his use of quotation marks in his translation of "De unione". Of course, it would be much more important to know whether and how consistent Babai himself is in his use of the Syriac citation mark *lam* (which can also simply mean "namely"). Are sentences marked with it clearly literal quotations? Or at least reliable key words or mere references? Does it mean anything if several *lam* follow one another in quick succession in a short text, or if *lam* is missing altogether, even though the sentence clearly does not reflect Babai's opinion (this is the case three times in Book 7)? And how much of such irregularities can be attributed to scribes? These questions only become important with more interesting "quotations" (?) than those of Book 7, namely with a tiny quotation from Theodore c. 21 and even more so with quotations from Hēnana c. 12. Placed side by side, the opposing sentences in Book 7 give the following picture:

Textus p. 252,24-26 (versio p. 205,7-9) "Verbum caro factum est, et ipsum est quod crucifixum est et passum est et mortuum", et: "ipsum in natura sua et hypostasi sua et⁴⁴ non alius, ne sint duo". 260,13 f. (211,11 f.) In the whole (bekuleh) the God Logos, who became flesh, died. 263,30 f. (214,1) "The virgin gave birth to God who became flesh." 268.6 f. (217.7 f.) Caro verbi ipsa est hypostasis et natura eius. 272,24-26 (220,28 f.) "Non separo assumptum ab assumente, ne sint duo filii; sed⁴⁵ 'factum est caro'." 274,5-8 (221,35-37) Quemadmodum corpus et anima sunt una hypostasis, homo, sic deus verbum et homo sunt una natura et una hypostasis constituta ex deo et corpore et anima. [230] 276,26 f. (223,36) "Misit deus filium suum et factus est de muliere" (Gal. 4,4)⁴⁶. 278,23 f. (225,22) "God who became flesh is Christ". 279.22 f. (226.14 f.) "Sanctus deus, sanctus fortis, sanctus immortalis, qui crucifixus est pro nobis". 280.16 (226.36) "Voluntate sua crucifixus est et mortuus est". 283,22-24 (229,16 f.) "Confitemini vos sumere; non corpus et sanguinem dei, sed corpus et sanguinem hominis".

⁴⁴ "Et" by me after the Syriac. - In the following, I do not always draw attention to the fact that I adapt Vaschalde's Latin more closely to the Syriac in minor details.

⁴⁵ The citation of John 1:14 is again marked by *lam*; Vaschalde adds: "dico: verbum".

⁴⁶ The context shows that the Bible verse was an argument of the opponents, Vaschalde saw this correctly. In Philoxenus' "Book of Sentences" (de Halleux's term for the "Tractatus tres de trinitate et incarnatione", which Vaschalde published as CSCO 9.10), no single verse is quoted as often as Gal. 4:4, with the exception of John 1:14, according to the register of biblical passages.

In this compilation I have taken the occurrence of *lam* strictly into account: the first passage (p. 252) appears broken up into two quotations (Vaschalde translated the second *lam* as "quidem", which I omit), the three passages (p. 260. 268. 274) that do not contain *lam* I reproduce without quotation marks. Can any sense be made of the use or non-use of the Syriac citation mark? Apparently one can only do so if one looks at the content of the statements. The compilation shows that we do not have a continuous text before us, but only the core sentences of such a text; this text in turn polemicalizes against Antiochian, more precisely against Nestorian theology. The author is a Monophysite, the Christology he advocates shows Philoxenian traits. The "quotations" p. 260 and 268 are such a coarsening of Philoxenus' Christology that this cannot only be the work of a less talented epigone, but that it already seems to me to be polemical in intent. The absence of the quoting *lam* would then be Babai's scrupulous and praiseworthy accuracy. In p. 274, too, the conclusion is probably already a polemical interpretation.

The problem of reliability will probably have to be re-examined for every job that comes into question. I will now go through some particularly interesting cases. In chapter 9, Babai quotes Philoxenus by name with his view of the miracle: the actual miracle is that which determines the content of the "Christology of becoming". Philoxenus' opinion is introduced with "dixit", which makes the quotation mark *lam* superfluous, but it is there nonetheless:

[231] textus p. 76,29-77,8 (versio p. 62,14-21) "haec non dicenda esse signa et miracula quae fecit dominus noster: quod aquam in vinum mutavit, quod multiplicavit panem, quod sanavit aegros, quod eiecit daemonia, quod suscitavit mortuos; sed haec esse miracula et signa quae fecit: cum non esset homo, factus est homo; eum non esset finitus, conclusus est in ventre virginis, et natus est ex ea hypostatice, et suxit lac, et involutus est pannis; cum non esset passibilis nec mortalis, mortuus est et sepultus est et resurrexit".

That this is indeed Philoxenus' view, we know from de Halleux's paper on the commentary on St. John's Prologue: "ce devenir constitue le miracle par excellence (f. 12r15r) "47, "le devenir de Dieu Verbe révèle mieux encore que ses miracles sa puissance, son immutabilité et sa grâce (f. 190v-192r; 193v-195v). "48 Babai thus gives at least a relatively reliable account here, relatively I say, because Philoxenus does not deny the miraculous character of the miracles, but compares them with the even greater miracle of the Incarnation. Stylistically, the passage could very well have been written by Philoxenus. In the "Book of Sentences" III 3, there is a similar list for the miracles of the earthly Jesus (in context, Philoxenus polemicalizes against the Antiochene view of the origin of Christ's human nature,

47 A. DE HALLEUX, *Philoxène de Mabbog, sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie*. Louvain 1963, p. 152.

48 Ibid. 158.

which he presents in a strongly distorted way, and the, in his opinion, misunderstood pro nobis, which is the consequence of this)⁴⁹: "Et etiam ea quae fecit, causa nostri valuit facere; verbi gratia quod mundavit leprosos, aperuit oculos caecorum, sanavit morbos, curavit dolores, eiecit daemones, ambulavit super mare, compescuit ventos, multi- plicavit panem, satiavit esurientes, suscitavit mortuos, aquam in vinum convertit, erexit curvos, stabilivit claudos, et omnia quae eum fecisse scriptum est".

In chapter 10 Babai presents the opinion of Paul of Samosata, this passage is teeming with *lam*, one of which is false and superfluous, and three at the end are not biblical quotations themselves, but their introductions, which summarize the context (for these four cases see the notes). Since the whole series of statements is introduced with "impie dixit", the first sentence quite correctly has no *lam*. I divide the section according to the *lam* [232] by quotation marks where they seem to me to be correctly placed:

textus p. 89,9-28 (versio p. 83,8-25) "Dominum nostrum esse hominem simplicem, velut unum de prophetis et iustis, in quo voluntas divina habitavit; et enim initium habuisse ex Maria"; "et non exsistere filium aeternum patri consubstantiali, sed unam esse hypostasim naturae divinae"; "et nomen Christi denotare hominem unctum et esset sicut unus de unctis, qui per honorem vocatus est filius sicut Salomon"; non⁵⁰ autem personam unionis duarum naturarum et duarum hypostaseon in una adhaesione filiationis; "et ex baptismo possedissee nomen filiationis, quia accepit gratiam spiritus sancti ut deus per eum adimpleret oeconomiam suam, secundum⁵¹ vocem in Jordane auditam: 'Hic est filius meus dilectus in quo mihi complacui'"; "et non esse deo filium naturalem, quia una est hypostasis dei"; "et hoc cognosci ex eo quod ipse Christus post baptismum, cum accepisset librum et legisset: 'Spiritus domini super me; propterea unxit me, etc.' postquam⁵⁰ legerat." postquam⁵⁰ legerat, dixit: 'Hodie impleta est scriptura ista in auribus vestris, sicut⁵⁰ illi, coram quibus legit, 'testimonium ei dederunt'⁵² se verbum eius ratum habere".

What we have here is a presentation of the doctrine of the Samosatene from the point of view of (Young) Nicene orthodoxy - homoousia of the Son and Trinity in three hypostases must be taught - and it cannot be older than the second half of the So if Babai is quoting verbatim, he is quoting this account and unfortunately not Paul himself; the source situation was not much better than it is today, it seems. There is a half-parallel to the first sentence in Nestorius: "dicit Christum hominem solum et tunc solum initium habere ex quo de virgine natus est "⁵³. The author of the account used by Babai could be Theodore of Mopsuestia, although this is pure conjecture; his vituperation of the Samosatean in the Catechetical Orations, also quoted by Facundus, in any case emphasizes that Paul does not attribute a hypostasis to the native: "Ange de Satan, Paul de Samosate, qui dit

⁴⁹ Ed. VASCHALDE, *Tractatus tres* ... Leuven 1907, textus CSCO 9 p. 208, 19-24 (versio 10, p. 155,6-11).

⁵⁰ There is a *lam* here, although the sentence is clearly a Nestorian interpretation.

⁵¹ Here is a *lam*.

⁵² "Testify" comes from Lc. 4,22.

⁵³ Sermo XVIII, ed. F. Loofs, *Nestoriana*, p. 304,6-8.

qu'est simplement homme le Christ Notre-Seigneur et qui méconnaît l'hypostase de la divinité du (Fils) Unique (existant) avant les siècles "54.

[233] At the end of chapter 12, Babai quotes Ḥenana with a few concrete individual statements, which are important despite their brevity and small number, because almost nothing has come down to us directly from the black sheep of the Nestorians. Guillaumont has conveniently compiled Babai's accusations against Ḥenana and his disciples⁵⁵, with ample evidence, including one of the passages listed here. Following the *lam signs*, I go further than Vaschalde with the use of quotation marks. The sentences are introduced with "sic impie dixerunt", so the first sentence has no Syriac quotation mark:

textus p. 137,31-138,2 (versio p. 111,6 f.) "Christus dicitur quia venit ad mensuras humanas", et: "factus est ex infinito finitus, et cecidit sub mensuram quantitatis" ⁵⁶. 138,3-6 (111,9-12) "Christus est deus, et deus est Christus", et: "haec appellationes nihil diversi denotant"; "quemadmodum nullum est discrimen inter unigenitum et primogenitum", et "haec duae (appellationes) idem significant".

In Syriac, "Christ" and "measure" have the same radical mšḥ, as Vaschalde and Guillaumont have already noted, so the corresponding argument only makes sense in Syriac. This gives it a good chance of really coming from Ḥenana. Babai has already alluded to this Christological wordplay in c. 957. Babai deals with the identification of "only-begotten" and "first-born" at the end of chapter 1758: "si dixeris primogenitum, ipse est; si dixeris unigenitum, ipse est ... *verumtamen non secundum idem*." "The same" is Christ, the one prosopon; the terms do not mean the same for Babai, but the same.

A statement about Ḥenana's view (it is not a quotation) that Babai makes in chapter 2059 belongs to the same problem area: "'Jesus' operationem tantum denotat absque hypostasi humana, ut interpretatus est (pšq) Ḥenana adiabenus." Theodor of Mopsuestia was already confronted with this objection, which is based on the interpretation of the name given in Mt. 1,21, perhaps this is Ḥenana's source - although the objection is so obvious that [234] one could also come to it on one's own. Of course, if, like Ḥenana, one was working to undermine the authority of the "interpreter", any older confederate was certainly welcome. For Theodore it was clear (as it was for his entire school) that "Jesus was the name for the assump-

⁵⁴ Hom. 13 (= 2nd discourse on baptism), ed. R. TONNEAU/R. DEVREESE (Studi e testi 145), Città del Vaticano 1949, p. 381,12-14.

⁵⁵ Les 'Kephalaia gnostica' p. 189 ff.

⁵⁶ Quoted *ibid.* p. 190.

⁵⁷ Textus p. 96,11 f. (versio p. 77,33), with the context quoted by GUILLAUMONT p. 189 f.

⁵⁸ P. 172,20 f. 24 (p. 139,14 f. 17).

⁵⁹ P. 209,17-19 (p. 169,17 f.).

tus "60 , just as of the apostles, who are called Peter and Paul; one could also say: thus (sc. Jesus) he is named after the birth from Mary⁶¹. Theodore's biblical evidence is undoubtedly Lc. 1:31, where conception, birth and naming stand side by side.

"But to this they say: the name 'Jesus' means Savior, but how can a man be called Savior? They have forgotten that the son of Nun was also called Jesus", although this is not even his birth name, but he was later called so by Moses; but it is clear that the name would not have been given to a human being if it denoted the divine nature⁶².

From the tiny Ḥenana quotations, which are not much more than keywords, it can be seen that Ḥenana attempts to invalidate the traditional Antiochian-Nestorian argument with the names of Christ on the same basis, if possible from the meaning of the word. His new explanation of the name Christ from the second meaning of *mšḥ*, which is only possible in Syriac, admittedly seems far-fetched. But certainly Ḥenana did not abandon the common Christian view for their sake. Only to the reproach that he subjects God to finiteness with his form of Christology does he reply with the little plea that the very designation "Christ" for God (namely as the incarnate second person of the Trinity) also implies precisely this, that the Incarnate One would be measured like every finite being; and if "God" and "Christ" denote the same thing, the statement of finiteness is also to be made for God in the case of the Incarnation. For Babai, on the other hand, the union of the infinite and the finite in Christ is a miracle for which there is no justification other than the fact itself.

When it comes to the titles "Christ", "only begotten" and "firstborn", Ḥenana's argumentation is not very convincing - if one is already *o p e r a t i n g* on this basis. However, we are missing the entire context, certainly on purpose. What made Ḥenana and Philo[235]xenus such dangerous opponents of the Antiochians was their own originally Antiochian training, which is always noticeable. Even the core sentence of the Philoxenian Christology of "becoming without transformation" basically makes use of the learned method in order to turn it against the former Edessenian and then Nisibenean colleagues: if one reads the second half of Joh. 1:14a ("and dwelt among us") is to be taken literally, and so literally that the first half ("the Word became flesh") is thereby interpreted all the more correctly, then there is no biblically (or biblicistically) justifiable reason why the converse should not apply. He also upholds the principle of the immutability of the Godhead (which his opponents regard as absurd, see above all Nestorius).

⁶⁰ De incarnat. lib. 12 (quotation from Leontius), SWETE II p. 304,14.

⁶¹ Ibid. I.14-16.

⁶² From the next quotation from Leontius, *ibid.* p. 304,17-27.

Finally, two small quotations from Theodore from chapter 21 are worthy of discussion here; it is also the only place in "De unione" where Theodore is mentioned as *auctoritas*. Ch. 21 is probably the highlight of the whole work. The first quotation is introduced with "dixit":

textus p. 246,7 f. (versio p. 199,35 f.) "Unionem dicimus adhaesionem duorum, ubi unum quid⁶³ reputantur secundum personam".

The second half of this sentence is taken up again ten lines later and marked as a quotation with *lam*, and Babai now says "dicuntur" for "reputantur". Another quotation is added with a new *lam*:

246.18 f. (200.9 f.) "Non secundum naturam sunt unum quid, sed secundum personam sunt unus filius, dominus, Christus, Emmanuel etc."

I have not yet been able to identify these quotations. They certainly belong together in the same context, without the second being a direct continuation of the first (which is also ruled out by the second *lam*, if one is to take it *sensu stricto*). Both quotations have in common the keyword "unum quid" and its factual filling by the term *prosopon*. The train of thought from the first quotation to the second can be reconstructed with some probability: first Theodore [236] gives a general definition of "unio", then he speaks of the case to which the definition is to be applied (but for which it was created specifically), namely the Christological one, where two natures are united by *synphesia* - this passage is not quoted here; then finally the application takes place with the result that Christ is "unum quid" as *prosopon*. It is remarkable that Babai does not cite the great master as the authority for the doctrine of the two hypostases; surely this passage did not provide anything for it, otherwise Babai would hardly have missed it.

III.

Babai understands his monograph as a systematically organizing presentation of the teaching handed down by the Fathers (versio p. 3). The Fathers, for their part, stand in the apostolic tradition, which in turn is based on the Lord (p. 2). Ecclesiality and apostolic tradition are emphasized throughout the book, naturally also in polemical contrast (for example in the doctrine of the articulated, non-spherical resurrection body) (p. 46. 84 f. 100. 111. 146; in the Vatican treatise p. 247).

⁶³ Here Vaschalde says "quid unum" against the Syriac word order; when he resumes the quotation, he correctly writes "unum quid".

In fact, all strands of Antiochian traditions converge in Babai's work, more or less precisely interlinked, usually still easily distinguishable from one another, especially when a reconciliation of slightly divergent topoi is not explicitly undertaken. Thus we find the common Antiochene theologoumenon of the "liturgical prosopon" of Christ, i.e. the unity of honor, power and worship owed to the one Lord; the Theodorean participatory Christology and soteriology continue to have an effect (whereas Theodore's baptismal theology and the eschatological doctrine of *catastasis* recede into the background); we find the theologoumenon of the prosopon of revelation, which was developed from 1. We find the theologoumenon of the prosopon of revelation, which was developed from 1 Tim. 3:16 and of which we do not know who first formulated it (perhaps in addition to the prosopon of honor), but which can probably be regarded as an Edessenian-Nisibene topos - alongside it, the idea appears occasionally, which we know from Theodore and Nestorius, that the humanity of Christ conceals his divinity.

Babai has a preference for adverbial neologisms in Christological nomenclature; Vaschalde gives a list of such adverbs and some corresponding abstracts in the text volume of [237] "De unione" ⁶⁴ that are not in Payne-Smith. But Babai also likes to use other adverbs, two of them really to excess, both serving to emphasize the Christological unity and its indissolubility: "unitive" ⁶⁵ (*mḥayyedāith*) and "et in aeternum" (*wal'ālam*), the first appears at least 175 times in "De unione" and in the Vatican treatise, the second at least 115 times. "Et in aeternum" comes from Heb 13:8: "Jesus Christ yesterday and today, the same also for ever", sometimes the whole verse is quoted. *Wal'ālam* is such a fixed expression, almost terminus technicus, that the "et" is retained under all circumstances, whether it fits syntactically or not; Vaschalde therefore often did not translate "et". Heb 13:8 is obviously regarded as a kind of Christological definition, where each individual component has a fundamental character. Babai, however, is not the first to discover that one can

"et in aeternum" to balance the Nestorian form of the two-natures doctrine: in the disputation given by Guillaumont, the Nestorian underlines the unity without separation with "continuellement et à jamais" (*amināith wal'ālam*)⁶⁶. Babai thus also found a (Nisibenean?) tradition here, but did he already use the *wal'ālam* tradition with such a hammering effect? An older tradition provided the Christian elements to be gained from Heb 13:8 with other accents. Babai also recognizes them and adopts them in three places: textus p. 62,2-5 (versio p. 50,4-8); 263,23-30 (213,29-38); 272,19-22 (220,21-25). In this tradition, both natures of Christ are found in the verse from Hebrews, whereby "yesterday and today" refer to the human nature, "and

⁶⁴ According to p. VI. Vaschalde only ever gives one location.

⁶⁵ In rare individual cases, the publisher also translates differently.

⁶⁶ GUILLAUMONT, *Justinien et l'église de Perse*, p. 65 and f. 19r 1.21.

in eternity" refers to the divine; the unity of the person is expressed by "the same". It is characteristic of Babai that in all three cases he concludes the exposition with his usual refrain that the one person of Christ is one "et in aeternum". The two interpretations of "et in aeternum" are not identical if one means the Godhead and the other the unity of the person - but Babai found nothing wrong with simply adding them together. It is clear which interpretation is more important to him; it is equally clear that it is more in keeping with the text and meaning to refer "et in aeternum" to "ipse est" than to the divine [238] nature of Christ. I quote here the longest and most detailed of the three passages, especially as it also contains a standard theologoumenon of Babai: Preservation of the two natures, their peculiarity and therefore also their hypostases, that is, the Nestorian interpretation of the formula that we know from the *Tomus Leonis* and the Chalcedonian definition:

versio p. 213,29-38 "'Jesus Christus heri et hodie, ipse est et in aeternum' scilicet⁶⁷, Christus servatur in natura sua et in hypostasi humana quae in tempore nata est ex beata Maria, et venit ad existentiam, et formata est per spiritum sanctum: quod est illud: 'heri et hodie'; et servatur in proprietate sua et etiam in hypostasi sua divina quae ab aeterno est, ante saecula, sine mutatione, 'et in aeternum'; illud autem: 'ipse est', significat eum esse eandem hanc unam personam, et hanc unionem non solutum iri nec confusum iri, et in aeternum'".

I have called the somewhat artificial division of Heb 13:8 into three proofs of the two natures and the unity of the person the older tradition, because traces of it can be found in Nestorius. In the Antiarian interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is the content of his *Sermo V*, "the one yesterday and today" (meaning: the one of whom *temporal* statements are made) is identical with the "seed of Abraham" of Heb 2:16⁶⁸. Sermon, the "saecula" of Heb 13:8 are referred to the divine nature, but the main point of view is that the verse shows how the name of Christ is an indication of both natures in their unity⁶⁹: "Interrogemus iam si nomen hoc, id est 'Christus' ... ad utraque designanda pertineat. 'Jesus Christus' inquit 'heri et hodie, ipse idem in saecula', sicut enim deus existens et homo, idem ipse secundum Paulum et novissimus et ante saecula, sicut homo quidem recens, sicut deus autem ante saecula".

If a quotation from Philoxenus in Dionysius bar Salibi, to which Assemani has already drawn attention and which de Halleux discusses⁷⁰, is genuine, then the doctrine of the ensoulment of the human body after 40 days, also of the

⁶⁷ = *lam*. So no citation mark here?

⁶⁸ LOOFS p. 234,16; p. 234,1-5 Nestorius describes the Arian exegetical method, which breaks down the text into the smallest individual components; for refutation one is forced to go back to this method.

⁶⁹ LOOFS p. 270,1-7 - Heb. 13,8 as a whole verse as evidence for the unity of the person in *Sermo XVIII*, p. 303,10-12.

⁷⁰ DE HALLEUX, *Philoxène*, p. 143 and p. 372 n. 34.

human [239] body of Christ (with an already existing union of Logos and flesh since the moment of conception), which plays a considerable role for Babai, as already formed in Edessa. Bar Salibi states in his commentary on Luke⁷¹: "Philoxenus dicit: Verbum deus et caro ex Maria simul ad unionem cucurrerunt; et postquam verbum factum est caro, sicut dixit Johannes, et mansit quadraginta dies in membris et formis, animam rationalem accepit iuxta ordinem hominum quorum corpus, postquam perfectum est membris et formis per dies quadraginta, animam recipit; apparet inde quod verbum caro factum est, nam per 'factum est caro' dicit: unitum est carni. Si quis dixerit: caro per hos quadraginta dies mortua erat, respondebis: vivens erat, quia vivebat vita divinitatis verbi. Et etiam in cruce, cum anima a corpore separata fuisset, corpus vivens erat vita divinitatis eius, quia haec non separata est ab alterutro. - Hic doctor est ex eis qui dicunt corpus prius esse anima". De Halleux has not found a parallel passage to this in the other works of Philoxenus, but adds statements that distinguish between incarnation and ensoulment as two stages; however, they can be contrasted with another that equates the beginning of the existence of flesh *and* soul with the entry of the Logos into the virgin woman. One could think of a possible doctrinal development, but even more likely that Philoxenus regarded the problem as theologically irrelevant.

This cannot be said of Babai. The ensoulment of Christ after 40 days is discussed in detail in chapter 10 of "De unione". The chapter deals with the point in time at which the union of divine and human nature took place in Christ. Babai goes through all the proposals in the chronological order of Jesus' life - all of them prove to be wrong, since the union exists from the first moment of conception, there is as little Jesus as a *psilos anthropos* in Babai as in any other Antiochian. It is therefore also wrong to set the date of ensoulment of the embryo 40 days after conception as the time of the union of the natures (versio p. 82). The problems arising from the validity of both the Christological thesis of the union of natures at the moment of conception and the anthropological thesis of ensoulment only after 40 days are discussed by Babai with some effort. Babai also successfully utilizes the definition of the human body as a [240] *structured* organism in another theological context, namely in the refutation of the doctrine of a spherical resurrection body in ch. 19. I will first present the anthropological view (which in turn is partly biblically justified) and then follow with the Christological treatment.

Babai summarizes this very briefly in the Vatican treatise, which begins with a definition of man and the relationship between body and soul in him: the embryo in the womb is "tanquam zoophyton, sine sensu, et cum incremento tantum" (p. 235) until it is animated. Ch. 10 of "De unione" introduces the

⁷¹ Ed. VASCHALDE, textus CSCO 113 p. 248,17-29 (versio 114 p. 201, 1-13).

from: During this time he is formed, shaped, structured, then the soul is created in him; from then on he is called man, for man is body and soul, not (merely) flesh and soul; the flesh is a component of the body but not (itself already) a body organized into members. The soul can only dwell hypostatically in the body as its house when this house has been built. We know that the soul leaves the body when the most important parts of it, the heart or the head, are destroyed; this is true both prenatally and after birth. The soul is created in the body from the outset in such a way that its union with the body depends on the existence of its most important members (p. 89). The days of natural purification (of the woman after birth) are proof of the interval of 40 days between conception and ensoulment. This can be found clearly, precisely and unambiguously in the Law of Moses; the Mosaic regulations are proof of ensoulment after 40 days in the form of the creation of the soul in the body. The still soulless body grows in the mother like a plant; because the growing being is weak and tender and also cold, because it lacks the soul that animates and moves it, an abundance that does not flow away accumulates around it; after ensoulment it then grows, if it is healthy, from further matter from which it is nourished. Once birth has taken place, the excess accumulated during the initial 40 days, which had the function of softening the fetus, is released again. This takes as long as the accumulation of the excess and results in the purification period of 40 days. What is excreted is therefore not part of the unity of body and soul. Not only is the purification period a fact of experience, but there are also doctors who have written about it⁷². Scripture and the Mosaic [241] law of purification make the matter quite clear, and Babai quotes Lev. 12:2-4, 6-8 (p. 94 f.).

In the Philoxenus quote above, the 40 days until ensoulment also serve the first formation and organization of the fetus; the number 40 would presumably have been justified by him in the same way. I have been informed by encyclopaedia articles on "ensoulment"⁷³ that ensoulment *after* conception, whereby 40 days are attributed to the male sex, but 80 days to the female sex⁷⁴, is of "most scholastic authors" (with reference to the same biblical passage) and that this view was considered Aristotelian. But Aristotle (*De generatione animalium*) is not very clear on this matter, and in any case he does not give these (biblical!) time limits. Waszink's discussion of relevant late antique and early Christian authors⁷⁵ does not provide any evidence before Philoxenus, and the theory used by Philoxenus and expanded by Babai appears in Waszink

⁷² Here one would like to know whether Babai's physicians also wrote about the [241] connection between the 40-day purification and the doctrine of the soul; his formulation leaves this open.

⁷³ DThC 1,2, col. 1309; LThK2 II, col. 294.

⁷⁴ Neither Philoxenus nor Babai speak of the female fetus, as they are interested in the Christological application.

⁷⁵ RAC 2, col. 176-183.

not. However, we can now see that the corresponding piece of scholastic scholarship is older than scholasticism and was already known at the end of the 5th century.

The second creation story is excellent evidence, not for the period of 40 days, but for subsequent ensoulment in general, and is particularly useful because from Adam one can draw conclusions about the general validity of mankind, and secondly about the special nature of the creation of the first man and the even greater special nature of the birth and person of Christ. The second is the reason for Babai to treat the two passages Gen 1:26 and 2:7 from the point of view of ensoulment. In doing so, he accepts that the subsequent ensoulment is not without consequences for the concept of the *imago dei*. Scripture explains how Adam was first formed in all his limbs and made into a body, and then it tells of the creation of the soul in him. By the face (into which God blew) it means the whole body *pars pro toto*, without the body there is no face; face (*appē*) is the *prosopon*⁷⁶ in which all the organs of sensory perception are located. And there, with Adam, his formation took place with the acceptance of the dust, even if the soul had not yet been blown into him, for it was now no longer mere (*šhima*) dust, but through his formation he was honored with the image of God. All this also has a pedagogical, instructive purpose: namely for the angels, who are to learn from the difference between the lifeless Adam before ensouling and the upright and God-praising Adam after ensouling, who is like them apart from the body, that God also created them as rational beings out of nothing. Of the two parts of the one hypostasis man - the bond of visible and spiritual creation - neither can be called the image of God, for the dust formed into the body, even if it is not yet united with its comrade, the soul, is no longer dust, but *initium imaginis dei*; the breathing in of the soul completes the image of God (versio p. 89,33 ff.).

For the Cyrillians - and Babai mentions Eutyches and Severus here, but not Philoxenus (p. 83,32 ff.) - the *unio naturalis et hypostatica* has the consequence that a conception after 40 days is out of the question, because the *unio naturalis* and *hypostatica* does not happen twice (p. 84,9 ff.)⁷⁷. For Babai, too, the union of both natures takes place at the moment of the angel's annunciation as the moment of conception, but the characteristics that apply to them are not "*naturalis et hypostatica*", but "*naturalis et hypostatica*".

"*voluntaria et personalis*"⁷⁸. According to the principle that each of the two natures is also in the union preserves its peculiarities, human nature keeps itself

⁷⁶ The Christological association that arises is intentional, cf. in the following "assumption" and *šhima* = *psilos*.

⁷⁷ The passage is interspersed with *lam*; all these probably Severan keywords would still have to be identified (likewise p. 88,24-30). It is not clear whether these opponents explicitly oppose the subsequent *getting*.

⁷⁸ Textus p. 91,2-21 (versio p. 84,23-85,4), where this provision occurs, is a summarizing Christological formulation, Babai's; what is written here is particularly important to him. The dignity

in Christ to their cabs; according to Heb. 4:15, Jesus is equal to us in everything apart from sin - to this, however, is added the miraculous virginity of his mother (this is a point on which Babai teaches quite orthodoxly and correctly, *virginitas in partu* included). This principle implies that in the union of divine and human nature that exists from the first moment (which union is indissoluble in eternity!) [243]) "the man of our Lord" ⁷⁹ is not yet completely finished, "his ensouled hypostatic character (*qnomtānuthā*) is not yet perfected" (versio p. 86,15 f.). The Niceneum also provides evidence for the subsequent animation of Christ, for it first says "eum incarnatum esse", and then the Fathers add "inhumanatum", which for Babai means "through the rational soul" (p. 87,27 f.). The doctrine of subsequent ensoulment by creation of the soul in the just-formed fetus also has a useful point against Origen and his pre-existent souls sent into bodies for punishment (p. 88.22 f.)⁸⁰. From the moment of conception, the not yet ensouled flesh is the dwelling place and temple of the Godhead, which human nature has assumed as its *prosopon*, through which it is formed and structured and through which the soul is created in it; thus it is not first the human being who is constituted so that the Logos can then take up residence in him⁸¹, but from the first moment of conception there is the indwelling of the Logos. Here Babai must remember that it is actually the Holy Spirit who "forms" ⁸² Jesus, but it is also true of the Logos that he dwells "unitively" in man - and the Father is pleased with this (which gives the dangerous keyword *eudokia* from the older Antiochian Christology a suitable place in the relation between Trinity doctrine and Christology) (p. 91,24 ff.).

Of course there is no question (any more than with the opponents) that the union with the God Logos happens twice, nor with the immortal resurrection body; it is always the same indissoluble unity that endures. At ensoulment the soul does not enter the body from outside, it is created in it as in all other human beings, nor does the Logos enter the soul of Christ from outside in order to dwell in it (p. 92). Even during Christ's rest in the grave, when the soul separates from the body in order to fly into paradise, the Logos is indissolubly united with both, and the soul's re-entry into the body at the resurrection does not signify a new union of the Logos with human nature, because this unity has always continued to exist indissolubly and unchangeably (p. 93).

of the passage is emphasized by the framing sentences: what is said here is the confession of the Church of Christ.

⁷⁹ This term is developed from the *kyriakos anthrōpos*.

⁸⁰ Cf. the 1st Anathematism against Origen of 543, from which these are the beginning and the end.

⁸¹ This is the opinion that Philoxenus tirelessly imputes to the Antiochians in the "Book of Sentences".

⁸² Lc. 1.35!

[244] It will have to be judged that a union of which such statements can be made is not loose and insufficient, but on the contrary of truly unique solidity, which is also expressly described as eternally valid. Viewed objectively, it is *more* than a hypostatic union, for the hypostatic union of body and soul (for this, cf. the beginning of the Vatican treatise for many other passages) can and will be dissolved, but the two natures in Christ can never be separated from one another, and their unity *t r a n s c e n d s* everything that human nature goes through in becoming, passing away and rising again. This is undoubtedly due to the divinity of the divine nature in Christ, so that its preponderance has an effect through its very being, despite all the apparent symmetry of the Christological construction. It is precisely the considerations about the subsequent ensoulment that show the Logos *to be* literally *person-forming*. What is irritating and misleading is that the term *proposon* nevertheless always retains its old meaning in Babai: what one sees from the outside, what one has before one's eyes. This becomes most obvious in the many attempts to explain the unity of the two natures in Christ with the help of examples. Even if one has to pay strict attention each time to Babai's indications that the examples only ever have an approximate similarity, and even if the *tertium comparationis* has to be established exactly in each case⁸³, the fact remains that the examples (most clearly the sun in the mirror) prove a unity that only appears as such from the outside. When Babai speaks Christologically in the proper sense, it cannot be overlooked that he means more and means something deeper. But even the so unsatisfactory parable of the sun in the mirror also has a positive feature that can be used to interpret Babai's intention: the immeasurable difference between the uniting natures, which makes the fact of their union a miracle.

Luise ABRAMOWSKI

[245] Discussion

Guillaumont - I listened to your conference with great interest. You have insisted a great deal on the role of Babai in the formulation of the two hypotheses. It is a fact that, when one parcourt les actes des synodes de l'Église nestorienne au cours des ^{ve} et ^{vie} siècles, one voit nucune des confessions de foi l'affirmation explicite des deux hypostases. You mention the Assembly of the Evangelists of 612: this is, it seems, the first time that we have seen the confession of the two hypostases formulated, in a nice way. Vous avez dit que cette confession de foi fut inspirée par Babai, et, de fait, on

⁸³ It would be worthwhile to compile the various comparisons, including positive ones, with the relationship between body and soul in Babai, whereby the subordination of the comparison to what is intended in each case would be the decisive factor.

remarque un complet accord entre elle et la christologie de Babai. Would it be celui-ci who, for the first time, also formulated the two hypostases?

I would like to point out that I published, in 1970, in the *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (no. 23-24), the text of a discussion that was organized, I think a little after the Peace of 561, between Orthodox theologians and a delegation of Nestorian theologians from Perse and led by Paul de Nisibe. In this text, one sees the Nestorian theologians affirming and defending, in an entirely explicit manner, the doctrine of the two hypostases; this is already the Christology of Babai. It therefore appears that celui-ci was not the first, in the Eglise de Perse, to explicitly formulate the doctrine of the two hypostases. His influence on this point, however, seems to have been decisive because, after him, the professions de foi of the Nestorian synods regularly include the affirmation of the two hypostases, whereas before it was not mentioned.

2.2 Babai the Great: Christological problems and their solutions¹

I About the shape of the resurrection body

In the 19th chapter of "De unione" ², Babai combats the doctrine of the spherical resurrection body, which the Ḥenana followers advocate for spiritualistic reasons, with his definition of the human body, including the body of Christ, as a structured one, which he had already used on another occasion³. The resurrection body is of course also articulated. The authority for this definition of the human body is Paul in I Cor. 124. For further clarification, Babai uses the Syriac synonyms for "corpus" and distinguishes them as "body" (*pagrā*) and "corpus" (*gušmā*) (Vaschalde helps himself by translating *gušmā* as "materiale"). Being structured is the more of the body compared to the (merely space-displacing, physical) body (textus p. 182,6-9; versio p. 147,17-20): "Everything that has body is also body; but not every body is body; nor is that called body which has no members, for behold, stones and wood and hay and dust are never called body." The passages in Paul about the resurrection, which [290] Babai quotes, all speak of *pagrā*, "body", whether it is our body or the body of Christ, so it must always be a structured body.

The articulation of the human body is an old topos of the debate with the representatives of the spheroid resurrection figure⁵, but Babai uses it with great vitality. Certainly, "sphere" as a mathematical or physical concept prompted the *gušmā-pagrā* argument. Brockelmann refers in the lexicon under *gušmā* no. 2 to a passage in Theodor bar Koni, where this vocabulary refers to the mathematical or physical body⁶. It is found in the

¹ See L. ABRAMOWSKI, *Die Christologie Babais des Großen*, in *Symposium Syriacum* 1972 (= *Or. Chr. Analecta* 197), Rome 1974, p. 219-244 [here in this volume pp. 89-110]. [For technical reasons, the footnote count of the original, which begins with each new page, is consecutive here - *ed.*]

² Ed. A. VASCHALDE, *CSCO* 79. 80 (*Script. Syri* 34. 35), Louvain 1915.

³ "De unione" c. 10, discussed in ABRAMOWSKI, *Christologie Babais*, p. 239 ff. [here in this volume pp. 105-109].

⁴ Versio p. 147 - To simplify matters, I often only quote the translation volume in the following, but I have of course always used the Syriac original myself. I have often adapted Vaschalde's Latin more closely to the Syriac; I only draw attention to this in interesting cases.

⁵ See below p. 291 n. 4 [here in this volume p. 112 note 7].

⁶ Theodor bar Koni, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. A. SCHER (*CSCO* 55 = *Script. Syri* 19, no translation volume [trad. R. HESPEL/R. DRAGUET, *CSCO* 448 and 463 = *Script. Syri* 194 and 197 - *the ed.*]), Louvain 1910, p. 55 - Another possible differentiation between *pagrā* and *gušmā* is noted by A. GUILLAUMONT, *Les 'Kephalaia Gnostica' d'Evagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les grecs et les syriens*, Paris

The second *memrā* of the book of scholia, this *memrā* deals with man as *imago dei*. In response to the question "What is body (*pagrā*)", the following definition is given: "Order (literally: arrangement) in natural members and delimited according to the wisdom that founded them" - Babai speaks several times in the 10th chapter of "De unione" about the "arrangement" of the members, which is constitutive for the body. Theodor b. Koni next asks about the difference between *gušmā* and *pagrā*: a body is also a body, but not every body is also a body - compare the Babai quote above. Theodor then defines "body" as living and endowed with sensory perception, whereas "body" is again the more general term, which also includes non-living bodies. Finally, "body" is defined as three-dimensional. It is clear that Babai and Theodor b. Koni draw from the same tradition and quote or use its definitions.

The details of Babai's polemic against the spheroidal resurrection body and the arguments of his opponents, which he communicated, are reported by Guillaumont in his Euagrius monograph⁷, [291] so I need not repeat them here. While in 1962 Guillaumont still leaves it open whether Babai's classification of his opponents as Origenists was a polemical trick or not⁸, he is now of the opinion that the accusation of Origenism has a basis in reality⁹; I agree with this opinion. We would have to see in this further evidence of Ḥenana's relations to the Greek theology of the 6th century, in this case to that of the Origenist monks of Palestine, even if one need not consider it "probable", as Labourt does, that Ḥenana studied with them¹⁰. Guillaumont also traces the topos of the spheroidal resurrection body, which can be derived neither directly from Origen nor from Euagrius, as far back as possible through the patristic literature (the oldest allusion to it seems to be found in Methodius)¹¹. In addition to Guillaumont's literature references, it should be noted that E. R. Dodds, in the commentary of his edition of the *Elementa Theologica* of Proclus, tentatively brings together the spheroidal resurrection body of the *Anathemata* of 543 and 553 with the Neoplatonic *ὄχημα*, the soul vehicle, because this is also spherical like the human skull, the stars, the universe¹². But the

1962, p. 114 n. 149: the Syriac translator of the Centurions says *pagrā* for the body of flesh, *gušmā* for the bodies of a different composition (angels, demons, spiritualized bodies), while the Greek original probably designated both types with the one word *σῶμα*.

⁷ GUILLAUMONT, '*Kephalaia*', p. 191 f.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 195 f.

⁹ A. GUILLAUMONT, *Justinien et l'église de Perse*, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23/24 (1969/70), p. 61.

¹⁰ J. LABOURT, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide* (224-632), Paris 1904, p. 280.

¹¹ GUILLAUMONT, '*Kephalaia*', p. 143 with n. 74, p. 114 with nn.

¹² Proclus, *The Elements of Theology*, ed. E. R. DODDS, Oxford ¹⁹⁶³, p. 308 on prop. 210 of Proclus. *Ibid.* n. 3 a nice variant: "According to Olympiodorus in *Alc.* p. 16 it is egg-shaped; having been distorted out of perfect sphericity by its association with the material body". In the addendum p. 347

The fact that the word ὄχημα is not used in the recurring debate about the spherical resurrection body seems to me to argue against the assumption that the Neoplatonic soul vehicle could be the *origin* of this [292] view, which seems so strange to us. Euagrius mentions *markabthā* twice in the centurions (I 67; II 51), which Guillaumont translates as "un char"¹³ and which can only be ὄχημα; but Euagrius neither says of this vehiculum that it is spherical, nor does he use it to describe the spiritual or resurrection body. In I 67 it could just as well be *organon*, otherwise often used by Euagrius, it is the *praktikē*, which is the vehiculum of the soul for attaining knowledge of God¹⁴. II 51: "Vehiculum of knowledge (are) fire and air; but vehiculum of ignorance (are) air and water", however, presupposes Neoplatonic views on the origin of ὄχημα; compare the paper on Porphyrius' statements in Dodds¹⁵. From the Stoic material that Joh.

"corpora orbiculata" (Jerome had already described the spherical form as stoic)¹⁶ and which is in part strongly ethically accentuated (sphere as complete form!), one can gain the impression that from here, namely the spherical form of the soul liberated from the body, an influence on the Neoplatonic concept of *ochēma* of the soul has emanated; the Neoplatonic soul vehicle has something inappropriately materialistic about it anyway. The spheroidal soul vehicle of the Neoplatonists and the spheroidal resurrection body of some Christian spiritualists would then have an element of origin in common, without having to derive one from the other.

The discussion about the form of the resurrection body is an offshoot of the debate about the identity of the earthly body and the resurrection body, with both supporters and deniers of the [293] identity referring to the same Pauline texts, I Cor. 15:17. For Babai, of course, it is *the same* body that is resurrected; among the errors about the resurrection body that he lists at the beginning of chapter 19 is the thesis of the

Dodds notes the evidence from Chadwick and Festugière, according to which the supposed evidence for the spherical resurrection body in Origen (*De oratione* 31,3) refers to the heavenly bodies. On the ὄχημα in Proclus and the Neoplatonists cf. in Dodds the Greek register s.v. and the general register s.v. "body" - "'first' (astral) body".

13 *Les six siècles des 'Kephalaia Gnostica' d'Évagre le Pontique*, ed. A. GUILLAUMONT, *Patr. Orient.* XXVIII, I, p. 49 and 81 (the softened "Vulgate" also has the vocabulary, p. 48 and 80).

14 This ethical use is also found in Gregory of Nyssa, as my colleague R. Hübner from Bonn instructs me.

15 DODDS, *n.d.*, p. 318 (in Appendix II "The Astral Body in Neoplatonism", p. 313-321).

16 Joh. BAUER, *Corpora orbiculata. A lost exegesis of Origen in Pseudo-Hieronymus. Zeitschr. f. kath. Theologie* 82 (1960), p. 333-341 - Bauer still sees in *De orat.* 31,3 as evidence for the spherical shape of the spiritual bodies in Origen. His proof of Origenic material in the Ps. Hieronymian commentary on Job is unsuccessful precisely on the point of the spheroidal spiritual bodies, although the other parallels are convincing.

17 GUILLAUMONT, *'Kephalaia'*, p. 115 n. 153.

"other" body the fourth. Everything that Paul says about the differences between the earthly body and the resurrected body refers to *the same* body. I do not believe that Babai is being over-interpreted when he says that holding on to the identity of the body accentuates the new that is created from the old through the resurrection. He reads the following from I Cor. 15:51 f.: "And behold, the whole man is transformed, in body and in soul, by being raised and blessed" (textus p. 182:16 f.; versio p. 147:26-28), - with which Babai brings the transformation into analogy with the creation of the first man¹⁸, it is new creation. Verses 53 and 42-44 say: "And behold, the same body that is sown, after it has walked mortally and lived this temporal and suffering life *through its soul*, lives immortally *through the power of the Holy Spirit* and remains immortal" (textus p. 182, 24-28; versio p. 147,35-148,3)¹⁹ So: the same body before and after the resurrection, it lives before and after the resurrection, but it is a completely different life in each case, because it flows from two different sources. It is the same body, but "it is *renewed in its nature* to immortality" (p. 183, 13 f.; p. 148, 18 f.). This body is "immortal and imperishable and incapable of suffering, and it lacks nothing" (p. 188, 14 f.; p. 152, 26 f.).

On the basis of the identity of the earthly and resurrection bodies, Babai allows himself to strictly subordinate the physical details from the resurrection stories [294] of the Gospels to the Pauline immortality of Christ's human nature renewed by the resurrection. He does this by declaring them to be miracles brought about specifically for the moment in question. Like his opponents, Babai is thus under the spiritualizing influence of I Cor. 15; where it is theologically irrelevant, he has no inhibitions about declaring something in the outward appearance of the Risen One to be mere appearance, namely his garments. Babai develops the following: Just as before the resurrection there were three miracles that were far superior to the human nature of the Lord and were intended to show the power of the *divinity* that dwells in her "unitive"²⁰ and in a *synapheia* (these are the virgin birth²¹, the walk on the water, the transfiguration story), so after the resurrection our Lord performed miracles that were *less*²² than the now deficient one,

¹⁸ Vaschalde translates: "... anima sua, *integer* et benedictus". However, Babai alludes with these words, which is not easy to recognize, to the creation story; for "*upright*" compare the description in chapter 10 (see ABRAMOWSKI, *Christologie Babais*, p. 242 [here in this volume p. 107]; versio p. 90,14 f.); "*blessed*" comes from Gen. 1,28.

¹⁹ This applies to Christians; with regard to Christ, these statements would have to be supplemented by statements about the Logos in its connection with human nature.

²⁰ ABRAMOWSKI, *Christologie Babais*, p. 237 [here in this volume p. 103 f.].

²¹ One miracle that demonstrates the power of the *deity* of the *Risen One* is the entrance through the closed doors to the disciples. Babai therefore mentions it as comparable to the virgin birth following this (versio p. 153,2-5) and not under the special class of miracles that are "lesser" than the resurrected body.

²² Cf. the previous note.

immortal body, incapable of suffering; their function was to confirm the doubters that it was the same body that rose from the grave as promised (versio p. 152, 18 ff.). Corresponding to the three miracles that are supposed to point to the divinity of Christ, there are also three miracles that indicate the corporeality of the Risen One (versio p. 154, 19). The renewed resurrection body is thus presented in these stories for the benefit of the disciples as a more earthly one than it really is: although it is incapable of suffering, it can show the stigmata, although it is without need, it takes food - this is what Babai wants to say. As far as the three miracles are concerned, I have difficulties counting them because, unlike the divine miracles of the earthly Jesus, Babai himself does not explicitly count them. Clearly, the first miracle is the most widely treated: the stigmata of the Risen One (versio p. 154,21 ff.), the second must be the eating and drinking of the Risen One (p. 156,18 ff.), the third his clothing, despite its kerygmatic insignificance (p. 156,35 ff.).

In detail it looks like this: The body arose incorruptible [295], (therefore) there were no torn and engraved stigmata on it; "he made" them "on him" (textus p. 190,26; versio p. 154,22) at the moment when he showed his hands and feet to his disciples. Nevertheless, they are real, genuine stigmata (see the repeated "truly" textus p. 190,28. 30. 31, "in truth" p. 191,3), not phantasmata. In any case, they had their effect on the disciples. After the resurrection, the disciples were initially unaware of the peculiarity and uniqueness of Jesus' resurrection: they did not know that he had risen to incorruption, but thought it was a resurrection to (renewed) corruption, as with Lazarus and those raised by the prophets. Such resurrected persons perhaps bore their old and new scars and wounds (by which Babai means that with the ad hoc production of the stigmata on his now imperishable body, Christ was responding to a possible expectation of the disciples, since they did not know better; here we see again how much the emphasis on imperishability can compete with the emphasis on corporeality). After the disciples had been brought to faith by looking at and touching Christ, the wounds were again assimilated to the immortal, imperishable nature, which has no wounds, the nature in which he was resurrected and in which there are no stigmata (textus p. 191,14 ff., 192,4 ff.; versio p. 155,3 ff., 23 ff.); in short: the stigmata disappear and the body remains in the incorruptibility of its nature (textus p. 192,19-21; versio p. 156,1 f.).

Combined with this explanation of the miraculous character of the stigmata is a comparison with the story of the transfiguration, which is evaluated in two ways. There on the mountain, the transfigured body was to demonstrate to the disciples the fact of his union with the divine nature, to show them the glory of the future resurrection body, and just as this ineffable light was then covered again, so it was after the resurrection. As then, he hid the splendor with the "fleshly color of mortality" until the ascension (textus p. 191,18-192,2; versio p. 155,6-21). This is the first evaluation of the comparison. Then

Babai repeats the argument (he says this explicitly; such repetitions for better memorization and further clarification occur several times in "De unione"), and the accent shifts: [296] reality of the glory on the Mount of Transfiguration, reality of the mortal flesh shown after the resurrection.

"Quemadmodum gloria illa splendens quam in monte ostendit *vere* erat, et deinde corpus eius in natura sua sicut omnia corpora quae adhuc in mortalitate sunt erat in colore carnali et in ceteris, sic et post resurrectionem *vere* eis ostendit colorem carnis mortalis sicut colorem omnium hominum, absque gloria sua, celans gloriam suam velo cuius causa potuerunt ad eum accedere et cum eo conversari" (textus p. 192,10-18; versio p. 155,30-3623).

The reality then also applies to the intake of food and drink by the Risen One; just as the reality of the transfiguration glow was mysterious²⁴, so too is what happens to food and drink in the Risen One: his holy hands guide the food into his holy mouth, but the food does not nourish but is miraculously destroyed. The same will happen to those who are affected by the resurrection transformation into immortality when they eat: the body will continue to exist as immortal, but there will no longer be any remnants of food in it (textus p. 193,8-28; versio p. 156,18-35).

Babai is not entirely justified in following his explanation of the resurrected body with "So also", because the decisive point is quite different: Jesus appeared to the disciples in the form of a clothed man, although *in truth* there were *no* clothes; for the linen cloths in which his body had been wrapped remained in the tomb (cf. also above in the same chapter textus p. 183,25-28; versio p. 148,30-33: the body rose with all its limbs, only without the linen cloths, which were found in the tomb and which were not necessary for the resurrection), and the clothes that Jesus had on before the crucifixion had been divided among the soldiers [297]. The clothes were only necessary to create a familiar appearance for the disciples. But the disciples had no doubts about the clothes, otherwise they would have been shown to them "truly", just as he showed them bread and fire and fish "truly", although how and from where they came is unknown²⁵. Jesus did not have to show the disciples the "truth" of the clothes, as they were

²³ Conversely, during the transfiguration, the divine "splendor covered the color of mortal flesh", versio p. 155,19-21.

²⁴ An allusion to the parallel between the Transfiguration and the appearances of the Risen One at the end of c. 9, textus p. 88,7 f. Vaschalde translates there: "et ex *argumento typico* quod in monte discipulis suis ostendit" (versio p. 82,12 f.). But in the light of versio p. 156,18 f. it is better to translate: "et e *demonstratione mystica* quam ...".

²⁵ Babai does justice to three principles in his treatment of the miraculous aspects of the apparition stories: biblicism, the Pauline understanding of the resurrection of I. Cor. 15 and the requirements of the two-natures doctrine; he takes the resulting absurdities in

should not preach the resurrection of the garments! Of course, he had to assure them of the resurrection of the body, since they doubted it and yet had to preach about it. Summarizing the function of the miracles, Babai says: "Until the resurrection, the teaching, signs and wonders of our Lord were mainly to show that he was not merely man, but also God, who dwelt "unitively" in the body of his temple. After the resurrection, it was his concern to convince the disciples that he had risen in his corporeality (textus 193:28-195:3; versio p. 156:35-157:33).

II Hypostasis and prosopon

Twice, in the 9th and 17th chapters of "De unione", Babai feels compelled to quote and interpret a Christological terminus of the "Fathers". The two passages read as follows:

textus p. 98,20 (third to fifth word). 84,28 (last word) - 85,526 (versio p. 79,21-26) "Et id quod dicunt patres sancti *personam naturalem et hypostaticam*, non est quia appellaverunt unam hypostasim, sed in hac illa persona unius domini Jesu Christi agnoscuntur duae naturae et duae hypostases divinitatis et humanitatis Christi, et non in distantia, sed hypostasis infinita in una adhaesione²⁷". Textus p. 164,18-22 (versio p. 133, 8-12) "Et idcirco patres de hac unione dixerunt *personam esse* [298] *naturalem et hypostaticam*, ad significandum naturas in hypostasi- bus suis agnosci in hac una persona Christi, filii dei, non autem naturas absque hypostasibus".

"Persona naturalis et hypostatica" is the term used here for the one prosopon of Christ. Although this designation must be vividly reminiscent of the unio naturalis et hypostatica of the Cyrillic tradition, Babai accepts it. Of course, he has to make the formula suitable for himself by an interpretation that completely contradicts the Cyrillic echo, in that he wants to take from the two adjectives the reference not only to two natures, but also to two hypostases, i.e. he reads the Nestorian Christological formula into them. Why, then, did he not prefer to dispense with the basically offensive formulation altogether, instead of getting out of the affair with this palpably embarrassing interpretation? The reason can only lie in the authority of the "Fathers" in question, which also covered such a formulation.

In fact, the surviving text of the Liber Heraclidis contains the formula "persona naturalis et hypostatica" at one point (BEDJAN p. 125,13 f., NAU p. 81,20). So it was the name of Nestorius, of all people, under which it appeared - no wonder that Babai tried to deal with it by reinterpreting it. Scipioni²⁸ quotes the second

purchase - by the way, they are not very different from those with which extreme monophysites struggle in their assessment of the *earthly* Jesus *before* the resurrection.

²⁶ In the Syriac manuscript there is a leaf reversal.

²⁷ Here we should add: "cum hypostasi finita", which could have been rendered by homoioteleuton.

²⁸ L. I. SCIPIONI, *Ricerche sulla cristologia del 'Libro di Eraclide' di Nestorio*, Fribourg 1956.

of the Babai passages given above three times: p. 125 (with ample context), p. 142 and 150, but without sensing their internal inconsistency. Scipioni's interpretation of Babai's interpretation of the formula is necessarily all the more difficult because he must consider Babai's explanations to be appropriate, p. 142: "Il prosopon dell'unione è veramente prosopon naturale e ipostatico, appunto perché è esso il principio della caratterizzazione e singolarizzazione dell'ipostasi: esso è infatti l'unico prosopon delle due ipostasi, il principio per cui Gesù e il Figlio di Dio sono uno solo, lui è sempre il medesimo. Sul piano del prosopon dunque, è chiara l'affermazione di un solo ed unico prosopon naturale e ipostatico". But not even Babai is that difficult. - Towards the end of the 17th chapter, Babai himself uses the formula "persona naturalis et hypostatica" once, but at this point in the plural (textus p 171, 9 f.; versio [299] p. 138,11). Although we are talking here about the Trinity, in which two "personae naturales et hypo- staticae" cannot form a hypostasis (Father and Son, for example), the Trinity provides the analogy to Christology, as the sequel shows. Even if the Christological application does not explicitly cite the formula again, it is perfectly clear how Babai would use it: for *each* of the two natures in Christ and *not* for the prosopon unionis, i.e. just as Nestorius and Ps. Nestorius use prosopon physikon, namely as prosopon of the nature in question²⁹.

I have shown elsewhere³⁰ that the adjectives "naturalis et hypostatica" are a gloss on the last word (that is "prosopon") of the dialog of Ps. Her., so they are not even from Ps. Nestorius, to say nothing of Nestorius. The only explanation I could give at the time for the intrusion of the gloss (I was not yet aware of its appearance in Babai) was based on the use of the formula "persona naturalis et hypo- statica" in Martyrius-Sahdona, where this refers to the one prosopon of Christ, whose unity is to be emphasized by the two adjectives.³¹ I assumed that someone familiar with the Christology of this theologian would have placed this gloss. Martyrius-Sahdona is somewhat younger than Babai, so the gloss would have entered the text "at the earliest one hundred years after the translation of the Liber Heraclidis into Syriac". However, since Babai already knew the text in its glossed form, this date must be revised. Babai's lifetime is now the terminus ante quem. Instead of simply assuming that Martyrius used the formula in Lib. Her. (where it appears *once*) in order to then give it a little more space in his own Christology, I am inclined to see in the gloss evidence that in certain Persian Dyophysite circles this formula was already in use before Martyrius, and on the one hand was included in the Lib.

²⁹ L. ABRAMOWSKI, *Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius*, CSCO 242 = Subs. 22, Louvain 1963, p. 183.

³⁰ ABRAMOWSKI, *Untersuchungen*, p. 182 f. with n. 81.

³¹ A. DE HALLEUX, *La christologie de Martyrius-Sahdona dans l'évolution du nestorianisme, Orient. Christ. Per.* 23 (1957), p. 18 f.; 21.

Her., on the other hand, was taken up again by Marty[300]rius. There can be little doubt that "persona naturalis et hypostatica" is analogous to "unio naturalis et hypostatica". Presumably, prosopon as a central Antiochian term for the unity of natures in Christ was to be theologically filled out and made more important in this way. Thus the formulation in itself has a mediating function to a Cyrillic-influenced Christology, i.e. to New Chalcedonian Christology - but do we therefore have the right to see in it the use of language of the Ḥenana school? It seems certain to me that the glossing adjectives in Lib. Her. were inserted for mediating purposes; but it is not easy to say which side would have had a particular interest in such mediation³². [301] Analogous to Babai's attitude towards the expression "persona naturalis et hypostatica", a difficulty elsewhere must be explained. In Vat. tract. (III, versio p. 240,9 ff.) Babai reports that he was reproached by argumentative people: "See, earlier Fathers also used the expression 'a hypostasis of two natures'" (textus p. 305,11-13; versio p. 246,9-

32 At the Roman "Symposium Syriacum" in the fall of 1972, P. van Esbroeck (B r u s s e l s) referred me to Leontius as a possible source of "prosopon physikon kai hypostatikon", and with the greatest kindness he informed me by letter of several passages from *Contra Nestorianos* by Leontius of Jerusalem which seemed to him to apply. I would like to take this opportunity to thank him most sincerely. The adjectives physikon, hypostatikon and even prosopikon do indeed appear in Leontius; thus PG 86 I col. 1572 C and 1573 A (van Esbroeck) hypostatikon prosopon, but there this means the face of the individual. Or col 1568 B (from II 14) may speak of the idiomata physika kai prosopika, which are numerous in the hypostasis of the Logos. But these passages do not refer to the *one* prosopon of Christ in two natures; this is different in II 34, col. 1592 C (van Esbroeck), where the expression *prosopon physikon* is applied to Christ, i.e. not to one of the two natures. At least *half* of the formula that appears as a gloss in the *Liber Heraclidis* and is used by Martyrius-Sahdona is present here. The same Leontius passage electrified me because it contains the terminus πρόσωπον τῆς ἐνώσεως, which we know from the *Liber Heraclidis* and accordingly also from Babai. The expression did not appear in the earlier known Nestorius fragments, but we now have the unknown continuation of a known fragment in the *Nestorian Collection* (ed. ABRAMOWSKI/GOODMAN, vol. II, p. 73, 2 f. and Apparatus p. 72), which proves that Nestorius could occasionally express himself in this way even *before* the second Apology. Leontius, *Ctr. Nestorianos* II 34, deals in my opinion either directly with Nestorius' book or with arguments and termini taken from this book by Antiochene theologians: not only does he combat the persona unionis as insufficient, he also recognizes prosopon physikon as a prosopon belonging to the individual natures, as pros. phys. of the [301] Logos and as pros. phys. of the flesh. He leads the Antiochians ad absurdum by arguing that their Christology must end with four prosopa, the pros. phys. of the Logos, the pros. τῆς ἐνώσεως of Christ, the pros. phys. Christ, the pros. phys. of the Flesh. Of these four, the third, the prosopon physikon Christi, is one declared by Leontius to be necessary: only this is ἐν πρόσωπον. - The only Greek testimony to the second Apology of Nestorius (in the extended form in which it is now available to us as *Lib. Her.*) has hitherto been the report in the Church History of Euagrius Scholasticus (Ab- RAMOWSKI, *Untersuchungen*, p. 13-15); with Leontius we now have a further, and *older*, Greek witness. Thus, the second Apology had already played a role in the Greek post-Chalcedonian debates before it came to fruition among the Syrian Dyophysites.

11). Here, too, Babai rejects neither the saying nor its author, but tries to explain why it was still possible to speak in this way in the past, which the progress of the argument now makes impossible. The father in question can be none other than Flavian of Constantinople, and again Babai's tolerance is based on the authority of Nestorius. As is well known, Nestorius (this is the real one) gives a very sympathetic account of Flavian's fate before and during the robber synod at the end of the second Apology (the account contains several interpolations³³). Not only is the parallelism of their fates important to Nestorius (Flavian, however, fared much worse than he did), but in view of the naive monophysitis of Eutyches, he also perceives a commonality in their Christological attitude: "I and Flavian thought the same" (BEDJAN p. 495,17 f.; NAU p. 316,28). Nestorius *does not* report that Flavian spoke of *a* Christological hypostasis, although it could not have been hidden from him with his knowledge of the Acts; but he quotes Flavian's "of two natures" (BEDJAN p. 471,11; NAU p. 301,13 f.). The advocacy of Nesto[302]rius for the unfortunate Flavian apparently also covers for Babai the Flavian *mia* hypostasis. The 17th chapter of "De unione" has the heading:

"De hoc: Quatenus est differentia inter hypostasim et personam et quomodo persona sumitur et permanet, et hypostasis non sumitur?" Babai begins with definitions of hypostasis and prosopon, then speaks of both terms in the Trinity, before finally moving on to Christology - unfortunately, a page of the Syriac text is missing during this transition³⁴. A shorter version of the content is provided by a section³⁵ of the Vatican treatise, which Vaschalde added as an appendix to his edition of "De unione". The lemma here reads: "De illo: Cur persona datur et assumitur, dum hypostasis nec datur nec assumitur?" Scipioni used both pieces in his Nestorius book³⁶. However, it is worth revisiting them in addition to what Scipioni has already noted.

The section in the Vatican Treatise (Vatican Tract II) seems to me to presuppose the longer version of chapter 17. A terminological difference is that "persona communis" (an expression from the genuine part of the Lib. Her., i.e. the second

³³ ABRAMOWSKI, *Investigations*, p. 118 ff.

³⁴ Cf. versio p. 131 n. 4.

³⁵ Textus p. 299,25 ff. (versio p. 241,37 ff.). A page in Vaschalde's translation of this section (p. 242) seems to have inadvertently printed an outdated stage of the correction; Vaschalde is otherwise very reliable, especially with regard to the termini technici. Line 1 f. "οὐσίαν substantiam" is a typical misread correction to which the adjective singularem has fallen victim; it should correctly read: "eam enim appellat substantiam singularem". p. 242,19: "hypostasis" is not marked as an addition by the translator; moreover, the addition is not correct, see below p. 313 [here in this volume p. 128 f.]. p. 242,37 "persona filiationis" should read "*hypostasis* filiationis" (cf. p. 242,14 and 243,28, where it is correctly translated). Unfortunately, all three cases are preserved uncorrected in SCIPIONI.

³⁶ SCIPIONI, *Ricerche*, p. 110 ff.; 125 ff.

Apology of Nestorius, which Ps. Nestorius does not use³⁷) appears in ch. 1738, but not in Vat. tract. II, where it is rather called, as elsewhere in "De unione" (also in c. 17), "persona unionis", which is also an expression of the real Nestorius. [303] "persona propria"³⁹ (a certain hypostasis of a nature) occurs in the later and shorter text: in ch. 17 it is used only twice⁴⁰, in Vat. tract II five times⁴¹. Compared with the Lib. Her. it is noticeable that the double use of "own", which Ps. Nestorius developed on the basis of some passages in the real Nestorius⁴² is missing in Babai; thus the prosopon "adopted" by the other nature is not called "own" (= made one's own). If you like, Babai thus falls short of the Lib. Her. The deliberate choice among the available termini is part of his systematizing intention, for the renunciation of the double use of "persona propria" makes the terminology clearer; also, the two-hypostasis doctrine, so important to Babai, receives a further accent if only the prosopon belonging to a hypostasis by nature is the "own" prosopon.

The thematization of the interchangeability of prosopa in special chapters indicates that Babai was aware of the importance of this theologumenon for the Lib. Her. The treatment of the subject is also dominated by the shift in emphasis compared to Nestorius (and even more so compared to Ps. Nestorius): for Nestorius the mutual use of the prosopa brought the natures or ousiai to union, because the natures are not directly capable of this⁴³; for Babai it is more important that the *hypostases* cannot take over the mediation. The fact that the prosopon is communicable, but the hypostasis is not, enters into the definition of the two terms with which Babai begins c. 17 (in Vat. Tract. II the definition is reduced to this difference). A hypostasis cannot be given in the manner of another hypostasis and assumed by it that the result would be a single hypostasis (c. 17 textus p. 161,1 ff., versio p. 130,17 ff.; Vat. Tract. II textus p. 301,7 ff., versio p. 243,2 ff.). While for Nestorius the negative

³⁷ ABRAMOWSKI, *Investigations*, p. 206 f.

³⁸ Textus p. 162,11 (versio p. 131,17 f.); 163,14 (132,11); 164,8 (132,33 f.); 164,17 (133,7).

³⁹ "Propria" = *dilānāyā*. In the *Liber Heraclidis* it is still called *dileh* instead. The adjectival form dispels any doubt as to whether, as with *dileh*, it could be a mere intensification of the possessive pronoun at the end, cf. on this problem ABRAMOWSKI, *Untersuchungen*, p. 186.

⁴⁰ Textus p. 160,27 f. (versio p. 130,12); 169,5 (136,24).

⁴¹ Textus p. 300,8 (versio p. 242,10); 300,9 (242,12); 300,10 (242, 12 f.); 300,27 (242,29); 301,3 (242,36).

⁴² Compare ABRAMOWSKI, *Untersuchungen*, p. 207 (with n. 3) on Nestorius with *ibid.* p. 185-191 on Ps. Nestorius.

⁴³ One ousia makes use of the *prosopon* of the other ousia, but not directly of the other ousia, *Liber Heraclidis*, textus p. 425,14 ff. Bedjan (versio p. 272,36 ff. NAU); 439,20-440,2 (282,7-10). Nestorius can very well say: "The natures are not without hypostases" 442,16 (284 f.), whereby hypostasis is obviously the concretion. The sentence belongs in the discussion about the distinction of natures only in the imagination (cf. Andrew of Samosata), which Nestorius rejects.

Whereas the aim of the topos of the exchangeable prosopon was the rejection of the henosis physike, for Babai it is the rejection of the one Christological hypostasis. In both chapters, Babai attempts to make the Christological prosopon exchange intelligible from a generality of the phenomenon, but in this way he naturally does not succeed in deriving the particularity of the Christological case, which is nevertheless self-evident to him⁴⁴. A prior restriction of the general validity to the prosopa and hypostases of *different* natures is not even expressed; it cannot be a matter of the Trinitarian hypostases exchanging their prosopa with one another or human individuals with one another⁴⁵. In chapter 17, the universality is demonstrated by the Trinitarian hypostases, which pass on their prosopa, which are also their names - Father, Son and Spirit - to humans, who then hold them "assumptively" (versio p. 130,28 ff.). The transition to Christology is missing, as already mentioned⁴⁶, but the Christological result is there (textus p. 162,7-13, versio p. 131,13-1947). It can be seen that what has been exchanged or communicated and accepted [305] in Christ is not only "assumptive", but also "unitive" ⁴⁸ [306]. The basis for the

⁴⁴ Cf. in c. 11 (versio p. 102,7-9): "unam ergo esse personam assumptis et assumpti, et hoc apud nullam creaturam umquam exstitisse aut existere nisi apud hominem domini nostri".

⁴⁵ The transmission of the Father's name *among men*, textus p. 161, 15-21 (versio p. 130,30-36), according to its two possible modes of generatio or of doctrina and gratia, must not mislead us, for both are only ways of implementing the assumption of the name "Father" from the first person of the Trinity, to whom it *actually* belongs. In the Trinity, the names (Father, Son, Spirit) are the prosopa (textus p. 161,7 f.; versio p. 130,22 f.).

⁴⁶ See above p. 302 with n. 1 [here in this volume p. 120 with note 34].

⁴⁷ These lines are a single sentence. - As a parallel passage cf. in c. 16 p. 154,21 ff. (versio p. 125,9 ff.).

⁴⁸ The substantiating character of the adverb "unitive" for Babai can be seen in the 16th chapter, in which the two-sons doctrine is rejected. Textus p. 152,25-28 (versio p. 123,27-30): "Si vero confitemur humanitatem *unitive* habere cum divinitate honorem et nomen filiationis et adorationem, cur nos arguunt quasi duos filios dicamus?" "Unitive" can be synonymous with "personaliter", the *antithesis* in both cases is "secundum naturam", as in the 20th chapter on the names of Christ. Chapter 20 on the names of Christ: the Logos gives what is his to the assumed human nature "unitive et non secundum naturam" and receives what is proper to humanity, so that he (the Logos) is called man and son of man "personaliter et non secundum naturam", and this giving and receiving takes place "ex unione" (textus p. 212,24-27; versio p. 172,7-10). Apart from the so very numerous cases where "unitive" serves to designate the Christological specific, there are a handful of exceptions where a unity other than the Christological is characterized by this adverb. This *does not* include versio p. 90,33, where the context establishes the Christological and not the reference to the first Adam, as is the case with versio p. 178,29-31. In "De unione" the only non-Christological exception, if I have not overlooked anything, is textus p. 129,20 (versio p. 104,19), in the example of the sun in the mirror. The mirror is a specially processed iron (highly smoothed). This processing makes the mirror iron, unlike ordinary iron, capable of absorbing the whole shape (σχήμα) of the sun *unitive* in itself and what belongs to the sun, so that it becomes hot and fire can be lit on it with the appropriate material. Nevertheless, there is no confusio of the properties, nor is the sun divided into parts by being absorbed into so many mirrors, nor is it

Exchange is the prosopon unionis⁴⁹, so that what looks like the result of the prosopon exchange is actually its theological precondition: "ex persona unionis sua inter se dant et sumunt". At the end of the sentence, however, the two biblical proof passages for the "one common prosopon" of the hidden and the revealed⁵⁰, namely "They spied in his face (prosopon)" and "No one will see my face (prosopon) and live", give the impression that the one common prosopon here is nothing more than the same vocabulary by chance; according to the Antiochian rule of *divisio vocom*, the correct understanding of the two passages would even be the *distinction between* the natures and their prosopa. Thus one will actually have to see in the two biblical passages evidence for concealment and revelation and not immediately for unity. The unity will not be this

into iron, nor does it assume the peculiarities of the nature of iron. But the mirror assumes everything from the sun, not in its nature, but through the unio with the sun is a shining light in a *prosopon* of the sun and the mirror. In order to evaluate the passage correctly, it is necessary to know what chapter II is about, namely: "Quomodo, cum deus sit in omni loco infinite, dicimus eum habitare in homine suo *unitive* et *peculiariter*". I think that in this one case "unitive" has slipped into the example more by mistake from what is to be explained. - All the other exceptions are in the *Vatican Treatise*, not in the (II.) section on the exchange of prosopa, but in the (I.) part on the hypostatic union of man and also concern this: textus p. 291,13; 292,18 (versio p. 235,14; 236,6 f.) "unitive et hypostatic", p. 296,26 (p. 239,23)

"naturaliter unitive". Babai never denies that body and soul form a unio, but this unio differs from the Christological unio precisely in that it is a physical and hypostatic union. Also referring to a hypostasis, but that of "any living being", we find "unitive" textus p. 298,12 (versio p. 240,34).

49 "Prosopon unionis" is written textus p. 162,7 in the status constructus, Vaschalde translates this (versio p. 131,13) as "ex parte unionis"; he proceeds in the same way (only he sometimes uses "nomine unionis" or

"ratione unionis", once also "propter unionem") in the other passages where the terminus appears in the status constructus instead of in the genitive formation with *d*. Without claiming to be exhaustive, these are textus p. 107,7 (versio p. 75,28 f.); 154,21.25.30 (125,9.13.18); 174,28 (141,13); 175,2 (141,16 f.); 175,30

(142,11); 213,31 (173,10); 214,6 (173,16); 214,17 (173, 26); 223,20 (181,20); in *Vat. tract.* 301,22 f. 25 f. (243,17. 20). Vaschalde is apparently of the opinion that Babai deliberately makes a distinction between ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܕܢܐ ܕܥܕܢܐ and ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܕܢܐ ܕܥܕܢܐ and that the latter case corresponds to the citation formula ἐκ προσώπου τινός known from Greek biblical exegesis. exegesis corresponds to the citation formula ἐκ προσώπου τινός λέγειν. But the formal parallel of the ἐκ προσώπου is not sufficient; and in terms of content there is the difference that the exegetical citation formula means that someone other than the πρόσωπον *actually* speaks, namely the a u t h o r, the Scripture or the Holy Spirit, while Babai's formula indicates precisely the enabling reason and not the medium of a statement. Vaschalde's translation thus leaves a whole range of evidence for πρόσ. τῆς ἐνώσεως disappears and thus blurs the eminent systematic function of the formula. The shorter form of stat. constr. corresponds best to a German c o m p o u n d noun, "Unionsprosopon", thus emphasizing the close affiliation of the constituents; in purely external terms, it may also be influenced by the ܡܠܟܐ forms possible in Syriac.

50 "The one common prosopon of the hidden and revealed" is a nice combination of the real Nestorius ("one common prosopon") and Ps. Nestorius ("prosopon of r e v e l a t i o n").

The following comparison with the unity of body and soul (although this unity as "naturalis hypostatica, obstrictica, passibilis" differs from the Christological unity as "naturalis hypostatica, obstrictica, passibilis") is not taken from the two quotations [307], but the unity already described above provides the precondition for the use of the two *prosopon* quotations here. The following comparison with the unity of body and soul (although this unity as "naturalis, hypostatica, obstricta, passibilis" differs from the Christological as

"personalis, voluntaria, non obstricta, non passibilis") has as its *tertium quid* that unity is the *precondition* for propositional communication and identity **a n d** not their result (versio p. 131,20 ff.). This confirms the interpretation we have just given of the preceding Christological proposition. As a particularly successful example of the communicability *and* unity of *prosopon* in two totally different hypostases, Babai obviously considers the gold coin with the image of the king engraved on it and the complete imprint of it in wax or clay (textus p. 164,26 ff.; versio p. 133,16 ff.). If anything, this example is capable of malicious misinterpretation, because the coin and the impression can be taken separately. But that is not the *tertium quid*. Babai knows very well where the limit of comparison lies: there is no (arbitrary spatial) distance between the two Christological hypostases (textus p. 166,5 f.; versio p. 134,14). It is unmistakable that Babai sees the preciousness of the gold as an appropriate image for the glory of the divine nature, and (the wax or) the clay of the imprint is certainly intended to associate man created from earth. Babai expressly says of the embossed gold coin that it is to be understood as the divinity of the Son, i.e. the hypostasis of the God Logos (textus p. 165,1 f.; versio p. 133,22). The imprint can be completely imprinted in wax or clay, so that the highest image of the king becomes visible again with all its honors, without gold and clay losing their nature and without the gold coin losing its imprint - and yet the *prosopon* of the king is one: "actually" and "firmly" it belongs in all its beauty to the hypostasis of gold, "assumptive" and "personaliter" also to the hypostasis of clay. (The adverb "unitive" is quite correctly missing in the parable; as expected, it only appears in the Christological statement itself, textus p. 166,3; versio p. 134,12). The inner theological yield of the example is not inconsiderable: one has the whole Lord even in the [308] inconspicuous nature of his earthly appearance, because this has received its imprint from the divine nature.

How little mint and cast as two different objects embarrass Babai can be seen from the fact that at the beginning of Vat. tract. II he uses them to demonstrate the general validity of the rule of the communicable *prosopon*. For him, the step to Christology is probably a conclusion *a minore ad maius*: if the unity of the *prosopon* after its transmission exists even in the case of coin and wax impression, then how much more so in the case of the two Christological hypostases on the basis of their union. In any case, he insists on the validity of the rule even in the case of spatial separation. While the hypostasis is "fixed", the following applies to the *prosopon*: "persona vero est fixa *et* assumi potest; fixa, quia indicat distinctionem hypostaseos, (id est) hanc (hypostasim) non esse illam; *et* assumi potest ab alia

hypostasi⁵¹, et sicut imago relative ad exemplar, *et etiam cum distantia*" (textus p. 299,29-300,2.3 f.; versio p. 242,2-4.6 f.). Vaschalde remarks on "distantia": "Id est cum exemplar non sit praesens". For Christology, on the other hand, the following applies: "hanc autem personam filiationis homo domini nostri sumpsit *unitive, non cum distantia*, nec ut esset hypostasis filiationis, sed persona filiationis" (textus p. 302,4-6; versio p. 243,26-28). The "persona filiationis" is, technically speaking, the "persona fixa" of the hypostasis God Logos. But the Logos also assumes a prosopon, hence the continuation of the passage just quoted:

"Et deus verbum, una de hypostasibus trinitatis, sumpsit ad personam suam formam servi, et habitu (schema) inventus est ut homo. Non autem factus est homo secundum hypostasim, sed formam servi sumpsit. Alius est assumens et alius assumptus" (textus p. 302,7-11; versio p. 243,28-32).

The last sentence in this form naturally offers the usual annoyance of Antiochene Christology; but one is entitled to read it thus: "Alia (hypostasis) est assumens et alia (hypostasis) [309] est assumptus" - qnomā (= hypostasis) is masculine in Syriac, thus also requiring the adjectival pronoun in this genus. "One of the hypostases of the Trinity" as an apposition to God Logos is quite common in Babai⁵²; it is a deliberate allusion to the Theopaschite formula "Unus ex trinitate passus est", which was dear not only to the Monophysites but also to the Neo-Cedonians. Analogous to "one of the hypostases of the Trinity", Babai can also form for the human nature of Christ: "one of the hypostases of men", so textus p. 300, 15 f. (versio p. 242,17 f.)⁵³.

This formulation is found in a passage which needs to be discussed in more detail and which I therefore quote here in full (textus p. 300,14-24; versio p. 242,17-26)⁵⁴:

"Et etiam humanitas filii est hypostasis subsistens, una (18) de hypostasibus hominum, sicut omnes homines, etsi non est (19) simplex (*šhimā*), sed plena divinitate. Persona autem eius (20) distinguitur non solum per hoc quod ad filiationem pertinet, (21) sed etiam per hoc quod non est Paulus nec Petrus secundum (22) hypostasim, sed per proprietatem hypostasis singularis (23) per quam distinguitur ab alia (sc. hyp.), sive imagine sua sive specie sua, sive forma (24)

⁵¹ I have omitted here the sentence versio p. 242,5 f. "et indicat omnia quae hypostasis possidet in sua distinctione ab alia" (textus p. 300,2 f.). The sentence is a gloss that has been placed in the wrong place; it belongs to the description of the prosopon fixum (= the "own" prosopon) and is intended to complete it; where it stands now, it makes the statement about the "assumed" prosopon almost incomprehensible.

⁵² Cf. also the headings of chapters 6 and 8.

⁵³ The same analogy (more complete), also as an interpretation of Phil 2,7, versio p. 102,16-18 (c. 11).

⁵⁴ I include Vaschalde's line numbers for easy reference. The translation has been corrected.

sua pulchra, sive puritate animae suae, sive sanctitate sua (25) sublimi, sive per hoc quod est in ordine divinitatis per unio-(26)-nem, sive per alia cetera".

Line 17 "*hypostasis subsistens*" - if the noun were also Latinized, it would sound very tautological, "subsistentia subsistens". Nevertheless, "subsistens" is probably the best translation if you understand the Latin verb very concretely as "to persist", which is one of its meanings. Babai's synonym for "subsistens" is "firm" (qbi'ā), as can be seen, for example, in versio p. 242.3355. However, Babai also uses "fixed" of the "persona propria" of the hypostasis (which persona, however, in contrast to the hypostasis, can be "given" and [310] "assumed" ⁵⁶, see versio p. 242.3657. Normally, "subsistens" as terminus technicus adheres to "hypostasis" ⁵⁸; and apparently so formulaic that Babai resorts to the "translation" with "fixed" in order to make what is meant more comprehensible). In the identification of hypostasis with "ousia singularis" (versio p. 242,1 f. 34 f.) Babai indicates that this definition belongs to the framework of a certain nomenclature not coined by him, which he uses here: "they are also called ..."; in the case of "hypostasis subsistens" he does not give such an indication at this point, he also uses this terminus ^[311] more often than "ousia singularis". But the first sentence of c. 17 contains both definitions linked together, and again Babai says: "hypostasis

⁵⁵ Another synonym is "fastened", *mšarrar*, textus p. 299,27 (versio p. 241,39).

⁵⁶ The heading to c. 17: the prosopon is "accepted and remains", combines both characteristics of prosopon.

⁵⁷ Adverbial textus p. 71,11.13 (versio p. 57,29.31). Synonym of "firmly": "naturally" p. 71,13 (p. 57,31), counterpart: "personaliter", "assumptive", "unitive" p. 71,12.14 (p. 57,29.32). What is meant in this passage

"firmly" belongs to the respective hypostases are the nomina "Son of God", "Son of Man"; however, Babai expresses himself elliptically: "Son of God" must be inferred from analogy to "Son of Man" (versio p. 57,30 f.); a few lines earlier (versio p. 57,26) "Son of God" appears as the name of the whole Christ, to which Babai associates the following, whereby he does not explicitly say that "Son of God" is now to be taken as the natural name of the divine hypostasis.

⁵⁸ Exceptions: "*persona subsistens*" c. 3, versio p. 18,32 f.: the example relates to the thing as the mirror image relates to the "persona subsistens" (textus p. 22,26) - the example here, by the way, is the Eucharist for the thing Christology. - Man and his reflection in turn as an example of Christology c. 17, versio p. 136,18 ff.; all the adverbs mentioned in the previous note appear here, including "firmly". - "*Natura subsistens*" c. 3, textus p. 24,20 f. (versio p. 20,9) in contrast to mere thought ("virtus rationalis"). - Quite difficult the "*naturae subsistentes*" *Vat. tract.* I, textus p. 296,29 (versio p. 239,26 f.): as God created the simple natures in their simplicity, so he also put them together in ἔνωσις, κρᾶσις, μίξις in each one of the naturae subsistentes (versio p. 239,24-27). This is not to say that the "simple" natures do not "subsist" or that

"subsistens" is identical with "composite", which would indeed be against all Babai's custom. The correct explanation is provided by the context, from which it follows that "subsistentes" in the place indicated is an abbreviation for the special kind of "subsisting" of composite natures, namely "subsist and work in each other (literally: from each other)" (textus p. 296,30; versio p. 239,27 f.). - The transient temples are contrasted with the "*veritas subsistens*" (textus p. 236,17; versio p. 192,12) of the actual temple, namely the human nature of Christ.

means ...". What Vaschalde translates as "subsistens" is *m̃qym*, which is to be vocalized as ptz. pass. Pael (this can be inferred from Babai's synonyms): *m̃qayyam*, also used as an adjective. *q̃nomā m̃qayyam* could correspond to a Greek ὑπόστασις μόνιμος⁵⁹. The full expression is *q̃nomā m̃qayyam byātheh* (textus p. 301,7), Vaschalde translates "hypostasis ... subsistens in esse suo" (versio p. 243,2 f.). But I propose to take *yāthā* here in its possible function as a reflexive pronoun (since the "being" is already given in the determination as *ousia singularis*), so that one would have to understand: "*hypostasis subsistens in se*", which would fit excellently with the meaning "firm", "fixed", "persisting". This is not contradicted by the fact that in the definition at the beginning of chapter 17, *yāthā* is provided with an adjective that is synonymous with "singularis" in *ousia*: *m̃qayyam byātheh l̃hodaitā* (textus 159.16 f.), Vaschalde: "subsistit in esse suo unico" (versio 129.4 f.)⁶⁰; in the following, Vaschalde translates the same adjective as "individuus", which is also preferable here. This would result in: "*subsistens in se individua*". "Subsistens in se" can also practically stand in for "hypostasis", for example in an anthropological definition where the human hypostasis is compared with that of an animal and that of an angel in order to make its peculiarity in relation to these two quite clear (textus p. 298,11-18; versio p. 240,33-241,361):

[312] (hypostasis humana) "non est tantum aer, aut ignis, aut aqua, aut terra, sive unitive sive mixte, sicut hypostasis alicuius animalis; neque (tantum) *anima subsistens in se* sine corpore, sicut angelus quidam qui simpliciter (*p̃šīṭāith*) ferit, et circuit, ...; sed (anima) cum corpore unita est naturaliter ...".

The basic condition of a spiritual hypostasis is ἀπλότης (*p̃šīṭuthā*), which is why such a "simple hypostasis subsistens in se" cannot form a new hypostasis together with another (therefore a hypostasis composita with the God Logos as a component is unthinkable). This is what is said with regard to Christology in c. 21 (textus p. 242,24-243,2; versio p. 197,10-18):

⁵⁹ Proclus, *Elementa Theologica*, prop. 102 (p. 92.10 DODDS). For a possible other equivalent see next page [here in this volume p. 128].

⁶⁰ The continuation textus p. 159,17 f. was translated by Vaschalde (versio p. 129, 5 f.) as follows: "et distincta est a multis non quia una facta est, sed quia interdum recipit apud ea, quae ...". Vaschalde has omitted "etiam" (textus p. 159,18) after "sed"; this "etiam" entitles him to insert a supplementary "solum" between "non" and "quia". This gives: "et distincta est a multis *non (solum)* quia una facta est, *sed etiam* quia interdum recipit ...". This is Scipioni's Italian version of the passage, o.c. p. 110, and also his explanation p. 111, line 6 from below. Babai is thus also easier to understand.

⁶¹ From *Vat. tract.* (I). Vaschalde's translation of the sentence is misleading. - Because of the use of "unitive", this passage has already been referred to at the end of p. 305 n. 1 [here in this volume p. 122 note 48].

"Nemo autem, sumens aliquid et praesertim aliquid non consubstantiale sibi, potest constituere cum illo unam naturam et unam hypostasim; nec potest aliquid aliud hypostasi eius adiici et ipsum esse eandem hypostasim *in simplicitate* (*pšīṭhā*) *sua prima*. Impossibile est enim assumptum esse cum assumente *unam hypostasim subsistentem*. Ecce assumens *praesubsistens*⁶² est in *sua hypostaticitate* perfecta et infinita, sicut pater et sicut spiritus sanctus; et quomodo additio fieri posset naturae infinitae?"

The argument with the doctrine of the one composite hypostasis in Christ and the opposing doctrine of the two Christological hypostases, which cannot form one hypostasis, obviously has such a proposition as can be found in Proclus as a prerequisite: τὸ ἀϋθυπόστατον ἀμερές ἐστι καὶ ἀπλοῦν⁶³. The conclusions of the Proclus from the composite nature of a hypostasis⁶⁴, dissolvability and loss of existence, must naturally lead to the rejection of the Christological composite hypostasis with regard to the Logos. Is perhaps *mḡayyām byātheh* ("subsists in se") a (presumably older) attempt to translate ἀϋθυπόστατον as accurately as possible? This would [313] not contradict the explanation given above (p. 311 [here in this volume p. 127]) by ὑπόστασις μόνιμος, for only the ἀϋθυπόστατον has μωνή, "persistence". Of course, for Babai, "subsists in se" is part of the definition of *every* hypostasis, not just the "simple", i.e. spiritual, but also the human one, which is explicitly described as composite. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body makes it possible for the Christian theologian, unlike the Neoplatonist, to say that the human hypostasis "remains" even after death, although, by definition, as a composite hypostasis, it initially dissolves in death⁶⁵.

The "simplicitas" of the last Babai quotations is not the same as in versio p. 242 line 19 (above p. 309) "*simplex* (*šḥimā*)", the other Syriac vocabulary already makes this clear, Vaschalde inserts "hypostasis" beforehand as an explanation, without marking it as an addition in brackets, as would be necessary. Moreover, the addition is not correct, because the reference is of course to "*homo simplex*", so that

⁶² The soul of a human hypostasis, on the other hand, is not a "hypostasis praesubsistens in se"; according to Babai's anthropology, it is created anew in every human being (see ABRAMOWSKI, *Christologie Babais*, p. 240 [here in this volume p. 105]); the human being is also not "anima subsistens in se", see the quotation above.

⁶³ So Proclus, *o.c.* prop. 47, p. 46,29 DODDS; almost verbatim also in the reasoning of prop. 86, p. 78,25 f.

⁶⁴ *O.c.*, p. 46,33 ff. and prop. 48.

⁶⁵ I consider *qnomā mḡayyām byātheh* to be a short form of *qnomā yātheh* in lib. VII (textus p. 254,15.17), Vaschalde translates "hypostasis sua propria" (versio p. 206,21.23), the complete form in the context textus p. 255,13 (versio p. 207,7). What is meant in all three cases is the "caro Christi", here the expression for human nature given by the polemic. - The "hypostasis subsistens" is often contrasted with the "dynamis" or "energeia haud subsistens", as in the definition of the Logos as a separate divine hypostasis in c. 5 and c. 20; cf. "natura subsistens" above p. 310 n. 3 [here in this volume p. 126 note 58].

line 18 f. must read: "etsi non est (homo) simplex, sed plena divinitate". This is a very important sentence for the correct understanding of Babai's Christology: even with the sharpest conceivable analysis of the person of Christ, an analysis that does not shy away from allowing human nature to become as concrete in it as the divinity - and nothing else is meant by the term hypostasis - it is impossible to disregard the foundation of the unity of the person⁶⁶ [314], which also determines the concretion of human nature in this unity, the human hypostasis: it is full of divinity. This is expressed technically in the following: the *peculiarity* of this human hypostasis is that it belongs to the sonship of the God Logos (*line 20*), indeed to the order of the Godhead through unification (*line 25 f.*)⁶⁷.

66 At the Roman "Symposium Syriacum" in 1972, Father Ortiz de Urbina took up the problem of the Stoic derivation of Babai's (and Nestorius') prosopon concept, as undertaken by Scipioni. My answer in the discussion, that for hermeneutical reasons this derivation cannot be dispensed with (only in this way can one understand at all why the unity of the individual personality of Christ is localized in the one prosopon and not already in the one hypostasis), unfortunately fell short of what I had already referred to in my Nestorius book. A. GRILLMEIER had already pointed out in his Nestorius [314] essay of 1961 (*Scholastik* 36, p. 321-356) that the Cappadocian doctrine of the Trinity had imparted this Stoic good to the Antiochians. For Basil the Great, the use of the Stoic analysis of the general concept (where only prosopon = name makes the individual personality, which is unmistakable, out of the individual specimen = hypostasis of the genus) is now definitively proven by the excellent expositions of R. HÜBNER, *Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser der sog. Ep. 38 des Basilios*, in: *Epektasis. Mélanges Danielou*, Paris 1972, p. 463-490, for our problem decisively p. 474-481 and 483. Taking into account this modification with regard to the mediation of terminology, one has to agree with Scipioni; it remains the outstanding merit of his book to have found the key to a problem which until then had found only highly unsatisfactory solutions. In view of Hübner's findings, the objections raised by Canon Turner at the International Patristic Congress in Oxford in 1971 against Scipioni's reference to the Stoa are also invalid. However, the theologians who applied the terminology of the Cappadocian doctrine of the Trinity to Christology were no more pure Stoics than Basil (cf. HÜBNER, p. 483: "All this shows once again that one must not make a Stoic metaphysician out of Basil and must be careful not to explain everything according to one scheme"); the Neoplatonic echoes that could be found in the concept of hypostasis (see above) prove the philosophical syncretism of the age with its possible variations. However, this syncretism is not indiscriminate, but the individual elements of which it is composed are generally subordinate to theological intentions. An only Aristotelian or only Neoplatonic or only Stoic derivation does not do justice to Antiochian theology (cf. HÜBNER, p. 482 on Basil: "The use of Stoic ideas in a limited problem of the doctrine of the Trinity did not prevent him from making use of Aristotelian concepts or Plotinian speculations in another").

67 The section, difficult enough due to the simultaneous pursuit of two concerns, still contains the additional difficulty of the syntactical and conceptual connection of the "sed" clause in *line 22*. Vaschalde helps himself by translating "sed" with "quatenus", omitting "per quam" (*line 23*) and translating "distinguitur" (repetition of *line 20*) with "differt", thereby achieving a tolerable smoothing. But on closer inspection, the "sed" sentence of *line 22 f.* is a duplication of the "sed" sentence of *line 21 f.*, namely an explanation of the latter in more technical nomenclature. I am inclined to see a gloss in this doubling. Without it, *lines 21-23* would have to read like this

[315] III Christ and the Holy Spirit

Chapter 17 on the exchange of *prosopa* is the last of Book IV in the version of "De unione" available to us today, which begins with c. 12. The systematic context of c. 12-17 is as follows: the double or even triple reference of certain designations of the person of Christ ("Anointed One", "Son", "Firstborn") to this one person and his nature on the basis of the biblical findings (c. 12-14), presentation of the same problem in the technical language of the analysis of the general term (but only apparently of the general term *per se*, in reality entirely from the point of view of the particular Christological requirements) - c. 17. The presupposition that makes c. 17 possible as a commentary on c. 12-14 and vice versa is the equation *name = prosopon*, *prosopon = name*. c. 15 and 16 are not accidental insertions, but deal with two problems that arise from the preceding: the baptism of Jesus (c. 15) as the *second* anointing with the Holy Spirit, and the perennial accusation of the two-sons doctrine (c. 16), an ever-present theme of Antiochene and Nestorian apologetics.

For Babai, the most recent contribution to the old discussion about the Christological meaning of the biblical names and titles of Jesus seems to be that of Ḥenana⁶⁸, which is quoted at the end of chapter 12, unfortunately only in key words. Ḥenana declared "primo- genitus" and "unigenitus" to be identical in meaning; this is the reason for the review of the biblical material on "primogenitus" in the very short 14th chapter. Furthermore, Ḥenana used the explanation "the one subject to measure" for "Christ", which is only possible in Syriac, in order to find the incarnate God in the name of Christ under the assumption that "Christ" = "God". Babai places Ḥenana next to Cyril (*versio* p. 111,4 f.: "Cyrillus enim et Ḥenana maledictus, sentina omnium haereseon, sic impie dixerunt"), but Cyril could not have argued well with the two *Syriac* roots *mšh*⁶⁹. However, when looking through the Syriac translation of Cyril's Apologies for his Anathematisms in *Brit. Mus. add.* 12.156, I came across *mšuhtha* = "measure" several times. In fact, Cyril likes to speak of the human aspect of Christ in the two Apologies in such a way that the Logos has subjected himself to the "human measure" (μέτρον τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, μέτρον τῆς κενώσεως and the like); on the other hand, the Logos behaves according to his divine nature

"(21) sed etiam per hoc quod non est Paulus nec Petrus secundum (22) hypostasim, (23) sive imagine sua, sive specie sua, sive forma (24) sua pulchra" etc. - What has been excluded would be the second gloss on one page of text (for the other, see above p. 308 n. 1 [here in this volume p. 125 note 51]); the extreme tightness of Babai's presentation makes such additions understandable. The glossator is well trained in the Nestorian or Babai's own definitions, and his glosses are correspondingly schoolmasterly.

⁶⁸ Cf. ABRAMOWSKI, *Christologie Babais*, p. 233 f. [here in this volume p. 100 f.].

⁶⁹ I initially thought that the combination of the two names in this matter was a polemical subordination of Babai, which is why Cyril is not mentioned in the first discussion of this passage (ABRAMOWSKI, *Christologie Babais*, p. 233 [here in this volume p. 100]).

to the Father ἰσομέτρως⁷⁰. Ḥenana thus spun a Cyrillic idea further by exploiting the linguistic possibilities of Syriac and turned it polemically against the Christology of his colleagues. We thus learn another desirable detail about his teaching, as he presumably referred to Cyril himself. Furthermore, this example shows once again that Babai's polemic in "De unione" is astonishingly concrete and correct in detail. If Ḥenana had not indicated the source of his thought, the whole thing would be evidence of Babai's own knowledge of Cyril; the existence of an old Syriac translation of the Apologies is proven by add. 12.156.

Ḥenana probably believed that his interpretation of "Christ" finally averted the danger of necessarily being pointed from the meaning of the word "anointed one" to baptism as the time of anointing and thus the institution of Christ (and the Son), in other words: to teach as was attributed to Paul of Samosata. The Antiochians and Nestorians were always confronted with the accusation that they taught nothing other than the Samosatans; Babai also rejects it (beginning of c. 1071). The doctrine of the double anointing of Christ, as Babai presents it in c. 12, has the purpose of retaining the name "Christ" in its actual meaning and linking *this* most closely with the unity of the person, without, however, refraining from the fact of the impartation of the Spirit and of the Son at baptism, since the Gospels report it. The mere existence of chapter 15 makes it clear that even this solution does not eliminate the difficulties. Antiochene biblicism has always brought to light the problem of the competition between Logos and Spirit in Christology⁷², which only reflects the different Christological conceptions of the NT; Cyril's 9th anathema derived from this the unjustified accusation that the Antiochians understood Jesus as a mere spiritually endowed human being. Although a Christology other than Logos Christology is just as unthinkable for the Antiochians as it is for their contemporaries from other theological schools, fundamental theological problems tend to arise again and again at different levels of the debate.

For Babai, "Christ" is the proper name of the human nature in Christ and at the same time a practical designation for the coming into being of the unity of the natures, because of the participation of the Holy Spirit in the conception (Mt. 1:20; Lc. 1:35), which in turn is the moment of the union of the two natures. The participation of the Holy Spirit is understood as an anointing⁷³, [318] although the two biblical

⁷⁰ Cyrillus, *Adv. Orient*, ACO I 1,7 p. 45,5 f.; 47,7 f.; 47,14 f.; 47,22-24; 56,9; 56,28 f.; 58,30 f.; *Adv. Theodoret*, ACO I 1,6 p. 119,5 f.; 123,12 f.; 124,3; 124,21; 129,10 f.; 129,14 f.; 138,22; 139,4; 139,6.

⁷¹ Cf. ABRAMOWSKI, *Christologie Babais*, p. 231 f. [here in this volume p. 99].

⁷² For Theodor von Mopsuestia cf. L. ABRAMOWSKI, *Zur Theologie Theodors von Mopsuestia*, *Zeitschr. f. Church History* 72 (1961), p. 287 ff.

⁷³ This is of course not an invention of Babai, but traditional, cf. the Nestorian in the Disputation edited by GUILLAUMONT (*Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23/24, 1969/70) p. 65: "... unité

The vocabulary is not used in the first place; however, it was easy to enter from Lc. 2:11 (the Savior born today is "*christos* kyrios"); but it is more likely that Acta 10:38 ("Jesus of Nazareth, as God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power") was combined with Mt. 1:20. For Babai, Ps. 45:8; Acta 2:36; 10:38⁷⁴ are evidence for the first anointing of Christ (i.e. these passages are fixed to the time of the union of the two natures in Christ with the help of the statements of the synoptic angelic proclamation). Babai frequently speaks of the *unctio ab utero*; a characteristic passage, where it is referred to humanity, is found in c. 8 (textus p. 68,1-4; versio p. 55,5-17):

"Et quemadmodum nomen proprium filii ad divinitatem Christi pertinet, sic et nomen proprium Christi ad humanitatem filii. Haec enim a spiritu sancto uncta est ab utero, initio formationis suae, ut esset cum deo verbo unus filius⁷⁵ in una adhaesione, in una virtute et potestate et adoratione et in aeternum ... Itaque ab unione et deinceps, Christus est filius, et filius est Christus, in una persona; et hoc modo in una persona agnoscuntur duae naturae et duae hypostases in proprietatibus suis. Ab unione et deinceps, deus verbum non est filius absque humanitate sua, neque homo eius, Iesus a Nazareth, est Christus absque divinitate sua".

The anointing is not something that can be said directly of the God Logos, so in the same chapter a little earlier, as an explanation of Acta 2,36 (versio p. 54, 11-14):

"Non enim [319] deus verbum factus est dominus, neque ipse unctus est⁷⁶ ut esset

de la personne de deux natures et deux hypostases, qui se sont jointes dans la sein de la vierge dès le commencement de la formation du corps, *par le moyen de l'onction de saint esprit* et par sa puissance, sans séparation, continuellement et à jamais". Already Theodore of Mopsuestia in a quotation from *De incarn.* XIV in the Acts of the Council of 553 (ACO IV I, p. 52,1-3 = SWETE II, p. 309, 24-26): "et *spiritus* autem non abest, utpote etiam in *loco unctionis factus ei*, et cum eo est semper qui adsumptus est". ⁷⁴ Acta 10,38 also appears among the biblical evidence for the second anointing of Christ (versio p. 109,16 f.). - Interpretation of Ps. 45 (44),8 with reference to Acta 10,38 in Theodore's commentary on the Psalms (ed. DEVREESE, *Studi e testi* 93); verse 8 b ("God your God has anointed you"): this cannot be said of God the Father, must therefore mean Christ, the statement distinguishes the unity of the n a t u r e s , shows unity of the prosopon (DEVREESE p. 289); verse 8 c ("oil of gladness"): those anointed in the law were anointed with oil, but *here* a distinguishing moment is indicated ("before your comrades"): this one is anointed with the Holy Spirit (Acta 10:38 noted by Devreese p. 290). - Two further anti-Arian interpretations of the Psalm verse, of which Athanasius' understands "anointing" quite naturally to mean the Holy Spirit, see next page n. 1 [here in this volume p. 132 note 76].

⁷⁵ The same justification for "Christ" as nomen proprium of humanity versio p. 56,20-22.

⁷⁶ The whole quotation gives the explication of Theodore's abbreviation in the interpretation of Ps. 45(44),8b (distinction of natures, unity of the prosopon, above p. 318 n. 1). - On "deus verbum ... neque unctus est" compare Ambrose, *De fide* I 3,24 (CSEL 78, p. 12,27-13,35 FALLER): "Denique habes in psalmo quadragesimo quarto, quod et deum patrem dixit propheta nec deum filium denegavit dicens: 'Sedis tua, deus, in saeculum saeculi' et infra: 'Unxit te deus, deus tuus oleum iustitiae prae consortibus tuis'. Deus est, qui unguet, et deus, qui 'secundum carnem' unguitur 'dei filius'. Denique quos habet unctionis suae nisi in carne consortes? Vides igitur quia deus a deo unctus. *Sed in adsumptione naturae unctus humanae* dei filius designatur, nec legis forma violatur". Faller's extensive apparatus

Christus in dignitate filiationis cum filio, sed humanitas eius uncta est ut esset filius cum eo in una persona". Elsewhere, however, it may simply read (c. 11, versio p. 102,5): "nomen Christi, quod unionem denotat", half a page further on (textus p. 127,8 f.; versio p. 102,19 f.): "Christus, cuius unctio est unio eius, quemadmodum nos saepe diximus".

The insistence on *anointing* in connection with the unity of natures does not, as far as I can tell, go back to Nestorius himself within the Nestorian tradition. For Nestorius too, strictly speaking, "Christ" is a name [320] of the human nature, just as "Son" is the name of the divine nature, as in Sermo X77:

"That is why the God Logos is also called 'Christ', because he has uninterrupted synapheia with Christ. And it does not happen that the God Logos does anything without humanity; what is accomplished most precisely is the highest synapheia, not apotheosis⁷⁸ as the newer schools believe.

But much more often Nestorius says that "Christ" and "Lord" and "Son" are names that denote *both* natures; sometimes one of these names reveals the divinity, sometimes the humanity, sometimes both, as it says twice in Sermo X79.

This means that Nestorius argues with the biblical findings and not with the etymological meaning. Loofs' register shows that "Christ as a designation for both natures" is virtually a standard term in the Nestoriana⁸⁰. It is not uninteresting that in this (albeit not exhaustive) register "anoint" appears only once, as the keyword "chrisma", with only one reference; and that is a term used by Marius

refers to Athanasius, *Contra Arianos* I 46 (PG 26, 105 B ff.) as a source. Col. 108 AB: The Logos is anointed, not that he might become God - he was already God before; not that he might become king - he already reigned eternally. The anointing happened *for our sake*. The Israelites became king through the anointing. The Logos, who always reigned with the Father, who gives the Holy Spirit, is here again said to be anointed, ὡς ἄνθρωπος λεγόμενος τῷ πνεύματι χρίσθαι that he may prepare us. - However, col. 109 C: The Logos is *not* anointed by the Spirit (cf. Theodore), which he himself gives, but by the flesh he has received.

Athanasius, Ambrose and Theodore offer three variants of the attempt to wrest Ps. 45 (44) and the corresponding passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews from the Arians as an effective biblical foundation for the subordination of the Logos with the help of two-nature Christology. The difference between the variants is very small; only the (well Johannine) binding (or even subordination) of the Spirit to (or under) the Logos in Athanasius is a clearly different accent compared to the Synoptic-Lucanian conception of the Spirit of the Antiochians. But we also find the soteriological explanation of statements that are difficult to accommodate Christologically in Babai. And the last sentence of Ambrose's quotation equates assumptio of human nature and unctio.

⁷⁷ LOOFS, *Nestoriana*, Halle 1905, p. 275,9-14.

⁷⁸ What Nestorius means is this: the problem is not how to deify human nature, but how to bring divine and human nature together conceptually in the first place.

⁷⁹ LOOFS p. 269 and 273.

⁸⁰ LOOFS p. 397 a.

Mercator formulated a text⁸¹ that Nestorius put into his mouth, which begins thus: "Ego unum Christum definio, qui a chrismate unctus sit dicendus ...".

The understanding of the participation of the Holy Spirit in the conception of Christ as an anointing, gained from the combination of various biblical statements, which in turn is determined by theological intention, came about long before Babai. But had anyone before him already drawn the systematizing or even schematizing consequence of now speaking of the *double* application of the term "anointing" to Christ (heading of chapter 12)? For Babai, Scripture itself testifies to the twofold application. An anointing takes place at the beginning of his "formation": the Spirit anoints and the Logos assumes human nature as his prosopon; this can be brought into a [321] relationship of consequence (versio p. 107,1782), so that the anointing appears as a prerequisite of the assumption - but both can be presented as simply simultaneous with the "formation", whereby assumptio still stands before unctio (ibid. l. 19 f.). Conceptio, anointing and assumption by the Logos are a single act (see above: "unctio est unio"), and Christ was "the anointed one" "unitive ab utero matris" (ibid. l. 21). Lc. 2,11 provides evidence that the one who has just been born is already Christ. He is so through "unctio sublimis" (l. 29). The

"Holiness" of Lc. 1:35 is the "special and exalted anointing" where the Holy Spirit takes the place of the oil (l. 32 f.). "Anointing" is defined as an act that confers an honor on the anointed that is much higher than his nature, hence Ps. 45:8 ("before your comrades") as a prophecy of Christ. In the case of the ancients, the sanctifying anointing set apart the office of priest, king and prophet; "the man of our Lord" is anointed with the Spirit for unity with the God Logos. Versio p. 108,9 f.:

"et unctio fecit eum filium et dominum" is inferred from Acta 2,36 plus Acta 10,38 (the "fecit" comes from the first passage). The magi worshipped the child as king and lord, and that is what he was through the unification. Babai interprets the magi's gifts partly Christologically, partly soteriologically; the magi wanted to indicate whom they were worshipping: with the gold the king, with the myrrh suffering and death, which were to conquer the devil, sin and death, the incense gives a clear indication of the temple worthy of worship, in which God dwells "unitive" in a synapheia "et in aeternum" (versio p. 108,19-27).

The second anointing, that in baptism (versio p. 108,28 ff.), has a soteriological and ecclesiological function and is the justification for our Christian name. The institution of the Son, which takes place in baptism, is the one that can be passed on to us. For this he becomes the firstborn of many brothers and is the first to receive the pledge of immortality and immutability (cf. Theodore of Mopsuestia), he receives it so that we can receive it in the same way, after him, and thus become his brothers and members of his body. The

⁸¹ LOOFS p. 359.

⁸² Cf. versio p. 107,33 f.; 108,8 f.

The two anointings are different and not identical; likewise we are not sons of God [322] in the same way as Christ is the Son of God, for his sonship consists in unio with the Logos, in assumptio to the prosopon of the Logos, and it is not this that the sanctifying baptismal anointing imparts to us. Although Babai once applies the terminus synapheia to our unity with Christ⁸³ as baptism creates it, he qualifies it with the adjective "spiritual" (textus p. 137,8; versio 110,19 f.), whereas the Christological synapheia, as he immediately adds, is qualified by the adverb "unitive" is determined. Through the first anointing, Christ is "for us Lord in ordine divinitatis" (textus p. 137,12 f.; versio p. 110,24 f.). After Babai has fought off the heretics, including Henana, he summarizes: "Veritas autem in ecclesia sancta servatur: nomen Christi denotat personam unionis" (textus p. 138,8 f.; versio p. 111,14 f.) - here he meets with Nestorius again.

C. 15 of "De unione" is not merely about baptism, as one might think from the superscription ("De baptismo; et quonam baptismo baptizatus est dominus noster"); the final sentence of the chapter makes it easier to recognize what it is about (versio p. 123, 14-17):

"Haec omnia vero diximus propter Theopaschitas qui negant assumptionem capitis generis nostri et delent proprietates naturae eius, et (dicunt) eum non implevisse oboedientiam nec iustificatum esse in spiritu ut scriptum est".

It is about the experiences of the earthly Jesus, especially about the influence of the Holy Spirit on him. All biblical statements about this are to be upheld precisely *because* they are biblical statements. What the Scriptures say is true and not a lie; to accuse the Scriptures of lying is sacrilege (versio p. 118,13 ff.). But all these difficult passages are to be explained on the assumption that Christ has already possessed the Spirit since his first anointing, that is, since his union with the Logos, that he has always and uninterruptedly possessed it; "'descendit spiritus', dum in eo erat" (versio p. 118,34). To avoid any misunderstanding, [323] it is expressly denied that Christ received the firstfruits of immortality "from without" in baptism, just as no power entered into him "from without" in the resurrection; in both cases it is the Godhead, which is in him, that raises him up or gives him the firstfruits of what is to come (the confirmation and completion of which is the resurrection) (versio p. 120,9 ff.). But if it is the case that Christ has always had the Spirit, then the question inevitably arises as to why it is said in Scripture that the Spirit descended upon him in baptism, or that the Spirit guided him, or that he performed miracles by the power of the Spirit. Babai gives the following explanation: Just as it became a reality

⁸³ To which I Cor. 6:17 (ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܝܠܐ; Peš. ܡܠܟܐ) provides the occasion. - Cyril uses this passage (the Greek word is κολλώμενος) to argue against the Christological use of συνάφεια in general, as it blurs the distinction between Christ and Christian. "Adhaesio spiritualis" still c. 21 on the same biblical passage (versio p. 186, 23), see below p. 330 [here in this volume p. 141].

Since it is part of Christ's human nature that the child Jesus grows to manhood, it is part of the reality of his human nature and its permanent union with the Logos that this nature also receives things after the union from the divinity in it that it did not have before, such as progress in wisdom and grace, such as baptism as a pledge of immortality. Otherwise the divine nature would not have taken on the mortal and mutable nature of Adam, but a different one (textus p. 144,11-20; versio p. 116,28-117,1). Jesus' fear of death, his need for consolation and his death have an instructive (with regard to the reality of human nature in need of redemption, which is his own) and reassuring function (with regard to the promises that are related to this nature):

"ut scriptura nobis ostenderet naturam adameam et debilem, quam deus verbum sumpsit, e natura sua debilem fuisse, et ordinem suum servasse, et relictam esse in naturalibus suis, ut (deus verbum) agnosceretur vere sumpsisse hominem passibilem et mortalem, qui est ex semine domus Abraham et David, et promissiones non esse falsas, et hunc (hominem) per oboedientiam suam iustificatum esse⁸⁴, et implevisse omnem iustitiam⁸⁵, [324] et passionibus perfectum esse⁸⁶, ut esset immortalis et immutabilis et primogenitus ex mortuis" (textus p. 145,14-23; versio p. 117,26-34).

Jesus makes experiences that should apply to all, as it says explicitly in chapter 8, Heb. 5:8; the corresponding sentence begins (like verse 8: καίτερον ὡν υἱός) with a reference to the sonship of human nature and the union "unitive et in aeternum", and then continues: "'ex timore et passionibus quas tulit didicit oboedientiam', *et quam proficua sit iis qui eam adimplent*" (textus p. 61,14; versio p. 49, 23 f.). The interpretation of Heb. 5:8 f. in c. 15 reads (textus p. 145:25-146:10; versio p. 118:1-1587):

"(1) Etsi enim erat filius ab utero per unionem suam ad (2) deum verbum in una filiatione, tamen, propter passiones, quas (3) tulit, didicit oboedientiam et ita perfectus est, id est, didicit id (4) in quo erat propter oboedientiam suam. Non enim cognovit im-(5)-mortalitatem et immutabilitatem quales essent donec illas in (6) hypostasi sua humana reapse accepit, quemadmodum passi-(7)-bilis⁸⁸ non cognovit donec in eis tentatus est, quia ea non habuit (8) naturaliter et sta-

84 This is a sentence of the so-called "doctrine of probation", except that this probation does not result in Christological unity, but is pronounced on its basis. "Per oboedientiam suam iustificatum esse" combines I Tim. 3:16 ("justified") with the "obedience" of both Heb. 5:8 f. and Phil. 2 (the latter two passages combined versio p. 49:24 f.), all this presumably not without the influence of Rom. 5:18 f., where obedience, righteousness and making righteous stand side by side - Christ's obedience and our righteousness. Christ's "righteousness" (the fulfillment of the law) could again be entered into the Rm. passage from Mt. 3:15, cf. the next note.

85 Cf. Mt 3:15.

86 Cf. Heb 2:10.

87 I insert Vaschalde's line count into the text.

88 The Syriac literally means "that which causes suffering".

biliter, sed per experientiam in hypostasi sua⁸⁹ (humana) accepit: (9) 'Non habemus pontificem qui non possit compati infirmitati (10) nostrae, tentatum autem per omnia sicut nos, absque peccato' (Hebr. 4,15). (11) Ergo⁹⁰ sine experientia, nec cognitiones quas expertus est di-(12)-dicit et cognovit; nec falsum est illud: 'Proficiebat statura sua (13) et sapientia sua et gratia' (Lc. 2,40). Vera enim sunt omnia quae (14) scriptura dicit ipsum in hypostasi sua humana pertulisse, non
(15) falsa; absit!"

The subject of the passage is Christ, the one prosopon of two natures (specifically: of two hypostases). In line 3, the "ita" that reinforces the Hebrews text in the sense of a conclusion is to be noted; even more interesting in line 3/4 is the interpretation ("id est") of ἔμαθεν by expanding the object and content of the "learning": he experienced what it was in which he found himself because of [325] his obedience. In the immediate context, this "what" is not the earthly vale of tears with its suffering, but immortality and immutability - otherwise Babai would not immediately make a statement about this in the next sentence (lines 4-6). In other words: Babai makes the "perfectio" the content of "learning", and he identifies the "perfection" of Heb. 5:9 with the (final) reception of immortality and immutability; we have already spoken above of the soteriological necessity of this reception through the human nature of Christ; it is to be considered in Babai's sentence and for him it is nothing other than a translation of "the author of eternal salvation" in Heb. 5:9. 5:9. The connection between obedience and perfection, which is not literally given in Heb 5:8 f., but is established by Babai, is probably derived from Phil 2:8 f. (verse 8 "obedient", verse 9 δῖό).

The sentence "Non enim cognovit ..." (lines 4-6) sounds very offensive when one considers that the subject here is also the whole Christ. But since the Antiochians and Nestorians had the most stringent conception of the divinity of God and thus also of the God Logos, Babai must not be understood here as if Christ, according to his divine nature, had to come to know immortality and immutability, but it is his human nature, i.e. his human hypostasis, which must first experience them, and it is also said of it that it receives both. The comparative sentence "quemadmodum passibilia ..." (lines 6-8) shows that the human hypostasis of Christ, which on the one hand first had to learn immortality and immutability because of the reality of its human nature, on the other hand, because of the reality of its ever-existing union with the Logos, does not receive both.

"by nature", does not "firmly"⁹¹ possess "suffering"⁹² but only experiences it

⁸⁹ Vaschalde translates *baqnomeh* as a reflexive pronoun: "in seipso".

⁹⁰ "Tentatus" from Heb. 4:15 and "experientia" lines 11 and 8 have the same root in Syriac.

⁹¹ On the "fixed" relation of peculiarity to hypostasis see above p. 308 ff. [here in this volume p. 124 ff.].

⁹² See above p. 324 n. 3 [here in this volume p. 136 note 88].

must. And since knowledge presupposes such experiences, the statement about Jesus' progress in wisdom is entirely appropriate (lines 11-12).

The pedagogical and reassuring sense of the descent [326] of the Spirit in baptism, although Christ has always had the Spirit, has still other aspects; also the baptismal narrative, which stands at the beginning of Jesus' public ministry, thus fits into the pedagogical considerations of the initial stage of the hearers and readers of the evangelical opening chapters:

"Et quia omnia priora in principio evangelii huius vivificantis sensibiliter facta sunt propter puerilem scientiam, quo magis firmarentur homines de iis *quae ad divinitatem spectant*, et crederent etiam *futuris quorum mysteria iam accepimus*, hac de causa spiritus sanctus visus est in forma columbae descendens et manens super illum qui spiritu sancto non erat privatus" (textus p. 149,9-15; versio p. 119,26-32).

With "divinitas" one could think specifically of the divine nature of Christ, so that from the compilation of Babai's statements on the meaning of the descent of the Spirit in baptism one could conclude that we are taught about both natures of Christ. But from the continuation of what has just been quoted we must infer that it is a question of the divine nature in general, and therefore also of the Father and the Spirit. The Spirit and the voice of the Father come "from above"; this must not be misunderstood locally, but rather the "sublimitas of the divine nature" is to be found therein. However, "sublime" (or may one translate "transcendent"?) is not only the divine nature, but also its union with humanity. We should learn this from the figure of the "perfect" bird, the dove. At the same time, the comparison between the complete form of the bird and the single Pentecostal flame of fire above the individual apostle's head offers Babai the opportunity to make clear the difference in the possession of the Spirit between Jesus and the apostles: Christ has the Spirit completely (i.e. Jesus is just not some spiritually gifted person like a prophet or an apostle). The whole passage reads (textus p. 149,30-150,13; versio p. 121,14-27):

"(spiritus) per visionem tamen corporeitatis volatilis perfecti, in forma columbae, descendit et mansit super illum, *ut omnes discerent* totam sublimitatem huius oeconomiae adorandae in eo perfectae⁹³: 'In eo habitat omnis plenitudo divinitatis cor-[327]poraliter' et: 'Ex plenitudine eius omnes accepimus'. Quapropter spiritus in apostolos ex parte descendit per visionem linguarum et divisus est super unumquemque eorum, sed super eum fuit tota perfectio volatilis in forma columbae. Et hoc non obstante quod erat templum divinitatis ab utero, et unctus fuerat in initio formationis suae ut esset filius per unionem cum filio aeterno, tamen, donec in baptismo accepit mysterium immortalitatis, nullam virtutem nullumque signum fecit, *ut disceremus* nos cum bap- tismo arrham vitae immortalis et incorruptibilis recipere".

93 Vaschalde translates the participle gerundively and pulls it to "sublimitatem". But "oeconomia" here, as in many other places, is synonymous with "unio" of the two natures (compare, for example, [327] the title and the opening of chapter 6, or versio p. 185,1 and 3; hence also "proso- pon oeconomiae", which is as much as "prosopon unionis"), and this is already complete.

After the baptism, Jesus' "nova conversatio" begins (versio p. 121,33), it is described with the usual keywords (healings, eschatological sermon), Babai adds: "et *erudiebat eos scientiam perfectam divinitatis*" (versio p. 122,2 f.⁹⁴). Incidentally, Christ could of course have performed miraculous healings even before his baptism, on the basis of his union with the God Logos, but it was not yet the right time (versio p. 122,3-6). In the same way, Christ could already now (in our present) bring about the universal resurrection of the dead and the subjugation of all things under his rule on the basis of his union with the God Logos, but he will only do so when he is revealed from heaven (versio p. 122,6-10). Just as Christ is Lord of all, but all things are not yet subject to him, so he possessed miraculous power before his baptism, but did not yet perform miracles (versio p. 122, 14-16).

Babai is thus able to find a sense in which the Spirit, which Christ does have, descends upon him at baptism; and this sense even has several directly or indirectly soteriological aspects. But how are we to imagine the combination of an existing Spirit and an additionally acting Spirit? Lc 4:1 shows that Babai is thinking of a special activity or activation of the Spirit that Jesus has always had (versio p. 122, 10-14), an activation in⁹⁵ [328] Jesus⁹⁶. This applies in parallel to the baptismal anointing: the Spirit who was *in* him gave him this (second) anointing through baptism (versio p. 123, 6-8).

IV Discussion of basic Antiochian concepts

The original final chapter of "De unione", c. 21, analyzes the traditional Antiochian terms for the Christological union (assumptio, habitatio, templum, vestimentum, adhaesio). This chapter shows the author's care in the structure of "De unione", as it corresponds to c. 2 (c. 1 has a purely introductory function), where, under the heading "De essentia aeterna naturae divinae", extensive considerations are made about the names of God, especially the biblical ones, always from the point of view of how essence and designation relate to each other.

In their Christological use, the five termini assumptio etc. have *a common function*; this function results in their peculiarity compared to the pro-

⁹⁴ Cf. p. 123.9 f.

⁹⁵ Cf. above p. 323 [here in this volume p. 136]: the offer of immortality does not come to Jesus "from outside".

⁹⁶ Passages in Acts that speak of the apostles being (again) filled with the Spirit (for a certain action), such as Acta 4:8; 13:9, are explained in the same way. Peter is assumed to have had the Spirit since Pentecost, Paul since his conversion. - Even Antiochian biblicism (cf. above the end of p. 319 n. 1 [here in this volume p. 132 note 76]) cannot do without the correction of archaisms.

fanen use; "quae ipsius propriae sunt", (Vaschalde's translation of the double *dilāh* of textus p. 227,24) in the following quotation is the expression for this (versio p. 185,3-6): "Hae quidem appellationes unionis illius adorandae, quae ipsius propriae sunt, *ad indicationem claram et inconfusam et unitam duarum naturarum et duarum hypostaseon in unam personam dicuntur*". Of course, the terms are not identical in meaning, and there must be a reason why they are all used. A reduction to the ordinary, profane use of the five termini reveals their differences from one another. This is quickly done (versio p. 185,9-26) with the following pairs: *assumptio* and *habitatio*, *habitatio* and *vestimentum*, *habitatio* and *templum*. Also, [329] each of these termini is not congruent with *unio*, which Babai explicitly states in this brief overview only in the first case. Babai then goes into great detail on *synapheia* (= *adhaesio* or *conjunctio*), which corresponds to the importance of this term in Theodore and Nestorius (textus p. 228,16 ff.; versio p. 185,27 ff.). An *adhaesio* takes place, for example, between the fish and the water, or between our clothes and our skin; but in these two cases of contact no one speaks of union, fish and water etc. do not represent "unum quid" ⁹⁷ because of their contact, not one person and one action, therefore the fish are not called "ex persona unionis" water and vice versa. "Unum quid" comes from the quotation from Theodore about *synapheia*, *unio* and *prosopon*, which Babai brings at the end of chapter 21 (versio p. 199 f.) ⁹⁸. On the other hand, one cannot speak of *synapheia* everywhere where *unum quid* comes about through union, because *synapheia* also means boundary and contact between two (contiguous) things ⁹⁹. Body and soul are hypostatically united, but this is not *synapheia*, one cannot say that the two (merely) adjoin ¹⁰⁰. Nor is the wood or red-hot iron burning in the fire in the relation of a *synapheia* with the fire (or vice versa). *Synapheia* on its own does not bring about a nature or a hypostasis. *Synapheia*, however, indicates the difference of peculiarity of hypostases; or of parts joined together; or of a part with the whole. *Synapheia* also means that there is no spatial distance in place and position between what is thus connected (since they abut one another). - Thus [330] Babai has succeeded in creating two useful definitions from one of the profane meanings of *synhaptō*

⁹⁷ "Unum quid" textus p. 228,19 and again line 23 (versio p. 185,31.35, Vaschalde translates "Aliquid unum").

⁹⁸ The quotation is discussed in ABRAMOWSKI, *Christologie Babais*, p. 235 f. [here in this volume p. 102].

⁹⁹ "Adjoining" is in fact one of the meanings of συνάπτω s. LIDDELL-SCOTT s.v. B, 1.

¹⁰⁰ What is meant is: "merely touching each other with the sides or edges, so to speak". This is an old topos of anti-Stoic polemic, although the Stoa did not teach the συνάφεια of body and soul, but understood body and soul as ἡνωμένον ζῶον, see H. DÖRRIE, *Porphyrios' 'Symmiktā Zetemata'*, Munich 1959, p. 31 f. Evidence for the anti-Stoic polemic from Chalcidius, Priskian and Nemesius i b i d . p. 30 f., 46; also p. 137.

The core passage of chapter 21 (textus p. 230,13-29; versio p. 187,12-25) makes clear not only what the special use of the five termini in Christology consists of, but also the special nature of the Christological union itself¹⁰⁸:

"(12) So this adorable and marvelous and inexpressible union has (13) *all these ways and goes beyond them* in the inscrutable and sublime (14) way of (union), which (is) more than parts that limit (15) each other, and which is not only a synapheia from without and not (16) an enclosing and limiting from within and not (happening) personaliter at (spatial) distance (17) and by will, while (the constituents) keep distance, *but* (that is the union:) *the infinite* (18) *in the finite*, and they are preserved ἀσυγχύτως, ἀκράτως (19) ἀμίκτως, ἀσυνθέτως, ἀμερίστως. This is not a union (20) at (spatial) distance, and the union is not finite, subject to necessity (21) and capable of suffering, but a willful and personal one to an (22) adorable oeconomia, in a synapheia and indwelling and (23) union of the acceptor with the accepted, and (it is) a συνάφεια ἀσύγχυτος¹⁰⁹ and an infinite (24) indwelling. In an infinite way, God dwells unitively in his finite (25) humanity, like the sun in the shining pearl, in a union".

[332] The considerations preceding this quotation had already shown that each of the five termini (habitatio etc.) is Christologically usable only in such a way that it does not exclude the other termini in their meaning; thus all five are usable in mutual determination (line 13), which makes a fundamental difference to the profane etc. use. use makes a fundamental difference. The preceding considerations had also shown that the five termini for their christological use received a new filling from the *result* of the christological unification: the synapheia etc. had to be such that a prosopon of two natures and two hypostases could be described appropriately. Christological unity is thus *more* than the addition of all these five termini (lines 13/14), even in their Christological orientation. This difference is not a quantitative but a qualitative one, for the infinite and the finite are united in Christ (lines 17/18). The infinity of the divine nature overwhelms the *modus unionis*, as it were, and makes it infinite itself (line 20) and thus unimaginable, incomprehensible; the descriptive terms among the five, such as "indwelling", are not up to this treatment: the "infinite indwelling" (lines 23-25) is no longer descriptive. What is vivid, however, is the result of the unification of natures, the one prosopon; the sun shining in the pearl (line 25) is an image for the perceptibility of the one prosopon (like the sun in the mirror¹¹⁰). The statements

¹⁰⁸ Line numbers from Vaschalde's translation.

¹⁰⁹ All Greek terms in this section have been substituted by me for the corresponding Syriac vocabulary.

¹¹⁰ S. ABRAMOWSKI, *Christologie Babais*, p. 244 [here in this volume p. 109]; Babai still speaks of the sun shining in the pearl c. 11, versio p. 106, 11 f., without elaborating on the comparison; he says that he has done this elsewhere, i.e. in another writing.

about the *unio personalis et voluntaria* in lines 16/17 and 21 are not in contradiction to each other - we know from countless passages in "De unione" that "personalis et voluntaria" denote the decisive difference to the physical and hypostatic union; in lines 16/17 the usual misunderstanding is averted.

Line 23 introduces the term *assumptio*, which Babai had not yet analyzed in c. 21; this is now done (versio p. 187, 25-31). The decisive achievement of the term is: "*assumptio enim exacte indicat naturas diversas in proprietatibus ipsarum*"; the *assumere* is "unitive", the assumed [333] is *prosopon* of the assumer and is "highly exalted" ¹¹¹ in the *ordo divinitatis*. After some digressions, the subject is taken up again in more detail (textus p. 232,14-23; versio p. 188,35-189,7):

"Assumptio et assumens, proprietates exactas hypostaseon completarum denotat: formam dei, unam de hypostasibus trinitatis, deum verbum, et formam servi, unam de hypostasibus hominum¹¹², hominem Jesum *unitum*, quem deus verbum ad personam suam assumpsit et in quo habitavit ut sese revelaret. Et quia impossibile est assumentem possidere proprietatem naturae assumpti, nec assumptus possidere potest proprietatem naturae assumentis, ergo assumptio ab assumente (facta) monet nos etiam de honore sublimi assumpti apud assumentem".

That is, "assumptio" makes us aware of both the extent of the distance between God and man, which was overcome in Christ, as well as the enormity of this overcoming. "Assumptio" (ἀναλαμβάνειν etc.) is always an abbreviation for Antiochian theologians, a cipher for Phil. 2. Of course, 2:7 is λαβών and not ἀναλαβών, so I wonder whether this is not an old (possibly older than Theodore of Mopsuestia) combination of Phil. 2,7 and the last line of I Tim. 3,16 (ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ) is present¹¹³, whereby the latter passage is very likely in the sense [334] of the former

111 ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܠܕܐ ܕܝܠܕܐ textus p. 231,3 (versio p. 187,30 "sublimiter elevaretur") is certainly an allusion to the ὑπερύψωσεν of Phil. 2,9. A substantival allusion with the same vocabulary AB- RAMOWSKI/GOODMAN, *A Nestorian Collection* I, p. 180,13 (II, p. 107,16 "an elevation to great dignity"): ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܠܕܐ ܕܝܠܕܐ In the Peš. the Greek composite appears as ܬܡܝܕܐ ܕܝܠܕܐ. When Babai explicitly quotes Phil. 2:9 in "De unione", he offers the form of Peš. (textus p. 131,2; 140,5; 175,15 f.; 283,17 f.; versio p. 105,16; 113,5 f.; 141,30; 229,11); the "Nestorian Collection" behaves in the same way.

J. KERSCHENSTEINER, *Der altsyrische Paulustext* (CSCO 315 = Subs. 37), Löwen 1970, has found in Ephrām ܬܡܝܕܐ ܕܝܠܕܐ (p. 84, nos. 480. 481), in Aphraates the allusion ܬܡܝܕܐ ܕܝܠܕܐ (p. 90, no. 526). The forms cited at the beginning of our note assume ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܠܕܐ which is certainly the most accurate translation; it combines elements from the existing translations (Ephr. and Peš.).

112 See above p. 309 [here in this volume p. 125 f.].

113 I Tim. 3:16 is the only one of the passages in question (Mc. 16:19; Lc. 9:51; Acta 1:2, 11, 22) that lends itself to such a combination. The Latin Vulgate has Phil. 2:7 "accipiens", I Tim. 3:16 "assumptus" (the pre- and post-Hieronymian material shows [334] practically no differences; the exception is Victorinus of Pettau, who was Greek and probably translated directly from the Greek NT: Phil. 2:7 "sumpsit", I Tim. 3:16 "receptum", see WORDSWORTH-WHITE *ad loc.*). Cf. Leo I (who knew no Greek) in the *Tomus*: "adsumpsit formam servi sine sorde peccati" (ACO II 2, p. 27,11 f.),

could have been interpreted. Strangely enough, Babai claims following the quotation above: "Quapropter patres in symbolo fidei suae dixerunt: 'assumpsit'" (versio p. 189,7 f.; cf. p. 197,9 f.). Vaschalde points out in the note that the two Syriac verbs which he translates as "assumpsit" are obviously intended to render the Greek compositum ἀναλαμβάνειν¹¹⁴. Shortly before, Babai had quoted from the Nicaenum: "incorporatus¹¹⁵ et inhumanatus est" (textus p. 232,8; versio p. 188,29); by the new "quotation" from the symbol he suggests,

"assumpsit" is found in the Nicaenum, but it is not there at all. Babai, however, is not the inventor of the assertion that places the "assumpsit" next to the "incarnatus et inhumanatus est" of the Nicaenum as being authorized by the symbol. Philoxenus also knows it: in his commentary on the Prologue to John, he explains that the "(*becoming*) man" of Christ is found in the Nicaenum, while the "assumptio" was stated by the Fathers of Constantinople (381)¹¹⁶. De Halleux quotes as evidence from the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum "from the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary"¹¹⁷ - but this colon contains as little of the word "assumpsit" as the entire confession or the as yet unexpanded Nicaenum. A little leafing through Hahn's collection of symbols¹¹⁸ revealed the probable source for the assertion of the [335] existence of

"assumpsit" in a symbol: Ps. Athanasius = Marcell of Ankyra in the "Expositio fidei" (PG 25). The Incarnation is expressed in the symbol explained there as follows: ἐκ τῆς ἀχράντου παρθένου Μαρίας τὸν ἡμέτερον ἀνέληφεν ἄνθρωπον¹¹⁹. Neither Babai nor Philoxenus made the combination of the two different Incarnation formulae themselves. - Philoxenus is the witness that it was known before Babai; and the false historical derivation of Philoxenus shows that he again did not know the origin of "assumpsit", although it must have been acceptable to him under the name of Athanasius. Neither is their interest in the formula identical: for Philoxenus it proved that "assumere" had to be interpreted as "becoming"; for Babai, conversely, it gave him the right to understand "becoming man" as "assumptio". This was probably also the opinion of the person who interpreted the Nicaenum through "Athanasius" and whom we therefore have to thank.

"*adsumpta* est de matre domini *natura*, non culpa" (p. 28, 7 f.) and "*carnem ... adsumpserit*" (p. 29, 15). But also: "*servilem formam ... suscepit*" (p. 28, 4 f.). - An example from Ambrose above p. 319 n. 1 [here in this volume p. 132 note 76].

114 Incidentally, this also applies to "assumpsit" versio p. 189,2 (and to 29,28; 30,5; there are probably a handful of other passages).

115 ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܡܪܝܝܐ. This is the Syriac version of the Nicaenum of the Synod of 410, CHABOT, *Synodicon Orientale*, p. 22,30 textus (p. 262 versio). But "De unione" c. 10, textus p. 95,2 f. (versio p. 87,27 f.): ܕܡܪܝܝܐ ܕܡܪܝܝܐ ܕܡܪܝܝܐ.

116 A. DE HALLEUX, *Philoxène de Mabbog*, Louvain 1963, p. 153.

117 *Ibid.* n. 17.

118 A. and L. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche*, Breslau ¹⁸⁹⁷³.

119 *Ibid.* p. 265,14 f.

among the Antiochenes¹²⁰. As far as Philoxenus is concerned, we have here further evidence of [336] the interesting fact that even in his Monophysite period he can never completely deny the traditions of Antiochene theology that he had absorbed in Edessa.

For Babai, Christological "assumptio" is not "taking" in any ordinary sense (versio p. 189,8-13): here something is not taken in hand and put away or thrown away again; even the rib that God *takes* from Adam in order to create something from it is not the object of assumptio in the Christological sense, for this leads to unio.

In general, it should be noted about the designations for Christological unity (versio p. 189,15-18): "Unumquodque ex his nominibus nos aliquid singulare docet quod aliud non habet. Etsi enim in aliquo consentiunt, in aliquo tamen differunt in significatione (quae est eis) apud seipsa". This precedes a discussion of habitatio, vestimentum and templum. *Habitatio* has the function of qualifying adhaesio: when habitare is stated, adhaesio cannot mean that God is only externally and finitely attached to the forma servi that he has assumed for his propositum. Babai has some difficulty with the idea of Christ's humanity as the *vestimentum* of his divinity. "Vestimentum enim cum eo, qui illud induit, non facit unionem" (versio p. 189,26 f.). Rather, it must be deduced from the fact of unio how vestimentum is to be understood Christologically; it will emerge that this "garment" is never taken off again, it is a

"undressable", "united" garment. A reinterpretation is thus undertaken. Nevertheless, Babai is also able to extract directly useful aspects from the traditional image: the clothed person and his garment are not one nature or one hypostasis (versio p. 195.35 f.; p. 195.33-197.10 is a coherent section on vestimentum). Just as a garment conceals the limbs it covers, so is

120 The influence of Marcellus of Ancyra's theology on Antiochene theology must be examined in detail. The origin of "homo assumptus", this expression so characteristic of Theodore and then of Antiochians and Nestorians, from Marcell's ("Athanasius") writings seems to me beyond question. The work of Martin Tetz on the transmission of these Ps.-Athanasiana, on the extent of Marcellian writing and on Marcell's theology now provides a secure basis for such a comparison (M. TETZ, *Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I-III*, *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengeschichte* 75, 1964, p. 217-270; 79, 1968, p. 3-42; 83, 1972, p. 145-194; *Markelliana and Athanasios of Alexandria*, *Zeitschr. Neutestmentl. Wiss.* 64, 1973, p. 75-121). Marcell would finally close the temporal gap between Eustathius of Antioch († before 337) on the one hand and Diodorus of Tarsus († before 394) and Theodore of Mopsuestia († 428) on the other; I do not want to make Marcell an Antiochian by any means, but only to draw attention to another element to be considered for the history of Antiochian theology. In any case, there is no smooth line of succession: it suffices to think of the special position of Diodorus, who was not Eustathian but Meletian, whose much-cited Christological writing was a late work that was peripheral to his interests, for whom the human soul of Christ was theologically uninteresting (which was already old-fashioned anti-origenist at the time) and from whom a line leads back to Euseb of Emesa.

the divinity is hidden in the human nature that it reveals¹²¹. The traditional special form of vestimentum is associated here as an image for the human nature of Christ: as royal purple.

[337] "Membra enim corporeitatis adorandae sunt regiae purpurae, quas induit deus verbum, a spiritu sancto praeclare contextae, e materia corporis virginis beatae Mariae. Et ab initio texturae, vestiens in ea fuit, et in aeternum, inextricandum et inseparabiliter" (versio p. 196,11-15; cf. 199,9122; 204,13 "vestimentum unitum").

If the king's robe is torn, this is not yet a wounding of the king's body, but it is a disgrace for the king as well as for the royal robe. This can be translated directly Christologically: the suffering inflicted on Christ's human nature is not *suffered* by the Logos because of the divine nature's inability to suffer, but the dishonor inflicted on Christ in his imprisonment and crucifixion does indeed fall on his divine nature.

"contumelia tamen, qua crucifixo templum et vestimentum eius affecerunt, ei incumbit, quia ipse habitat in eo unitive et vestimentum eius est sumptum. Etenim qui vestimentum suum induit, non induit illud absque assumptione¹²³; nec vestimentum eius est distans ab illo, sed illi adhaeret¹²⁴" (textus p. 242,18-23; versio p. 197.4-9)¹²⁵.

Unlike "robe", "temple" does not have to be reinterpreted as a designation for the human nature of Christ; on the contrary, here the Christological use only reveals what [338] "temple" actually means. *This* temple does not undergo any transformation or decommissioning, because the deity dwelling in it never leaves it. Just as the anointed, priests, firstborn and kings prefigured Christ, the archetype, so the ancient temples prefigured the constant truth of this actual temple, for in *it* dwells the entire fullness of the Godhead (versio p. 192.5-13).

¹²¹ Note how the two traditional functions of Christ's humanity are *l i n k e d* here: Christ's human nature *conceals* and *reveals* the divine nature inherent in it.

¹²² Babai's preference for adverbs celebrates triumphs here: ܐܝܢܐ ܕܝܚܝܐ ܕܝܚܝܐ textus p. 241,23; 245,10.

¹²³ An adverb in Syriac.

¹²⁴ See the previous note.

¹²⁵ Nestorius demonstrates the affectedness of the Logos by comparison with the king and his statue: desecration of the statue is desecration of the ruler. Thus in a passage in the letter to Alexander of Hierapolis, which Severus quotes twice (in *Ctr. Gramm.* and in *Philaethes*), see ABRAMOVSKI, *Untersuchungen*, p. 227 f. with n. 41. Veneration of the humanity of Christ compared with the veneration of images of emperors in Theodore of Mopsuestia, *De incarn.* XIV, ACO IV I, p. 51,21-32 = SWETE II, p. 309, 9-30 - Babai *does not* adopt the comparison of human nature with the imperial statue (and thus tacitly sets himself apart from Theodore): the same objections would apply against this comparison as against the comparison with the envoy (spatial separation). - Nestorius himself corrects the image of the royal purple under a different aspect: "adoro tanquam *animatam* regis purpuram" (*Sermo IX*), see ABRAMOWSKI, *Untersuchungen*, p. 228.

"Itaque humanitas Christi, filii dei, est templum divinitatis Christi, filii dei, modo peculiari et sublimi, cui nihil aequale est" (versio p. 194,6-8).

In the discussion of "vestimentum" and "templum", the "messenger" or the ἀντικαῖσρα also appears several times as a comparison for the human nature of Christ, but always only to be *rejected* (versio p. 191,34 f.; 197,34-36; 199,8; 204,14. 22-24). For the comparison inevitably implies spatial distance - the messenger appears because the one he represents is not himself in the same place. The fact that the possibility of comparison is considered at all is due to the view that the envoy represents the person of the person sending him, i.e. "carries his prosopon". But "the king does not" conversely "bear the prosopon of the envoy" (textus p. 251,27; versio p. 204,20 f.). However, this reciprocity, i.e. the prosopon exchange, is decisive for Christology: "As the humanity of our Lord bears the prosopon of his divinity, so also his divinity bears that of his humanity in a synapheia" (textus p. 251,25-27; versio p. 204,18-20).

Ch. 21 concludes as follows (textus p. 252,1-15; versio p. 204,23-36)¹²⁶:

"Hic ergo myste-(24)-rium est magnum et stupendum et res mirabilis, quia deus (25) verbum formam servi ad personam suam sumpsit, id est, (26) hominem completum, et habitavit in eo unitive infinite: (27) 'manifestatus est in carne' (I. Tim. 3,16); et humanitas eius, per unio-(28)-nem eum illo, accepit nomen excellentius omnibus nominibus, (29) id est, filium et dominum, in una potestate et in una domi-(30)-natione. Et *ille* factus est is secundum unionem, non secundum (31) naturam: 'filius hominis qui est in caelo' (Ioh. 3,13); et is factus est (32) *ille* secundum unionem, non secundum naturam, id est, filius (33) et dominus gloriae. Et in hac una persona agnoscuntur duae (34) naturae cum proprietatibus suis sine separatione; et [339] unus est (35) dominus Jesus Christus, filius dei unigenitus, heri et hodie et (36) in aeternum" (a Gloria patri follows).

It is no coincidence that the assessment of the Christological fact as a miracle appears in such a prominent place here at the end of the 21st chapter (i.e. at the original end of "De unione"), in the summary (line 23 f.). It pervades the entire book. The miraculousness in turn justifies anew the various designations for the union of the natures, because one of them alone is not sufficient to grasp the miracle:

"Dictum est enim: habitatio, et adhaesio, et templum, et vestimentum, et unio, quia non potes per unum exemplum unamque appellationem discentibus declarare et confirmare hanc unionem mirabilem, inconfusam et non admixtam et immixtam¹²⁷ et impassibilem, id est, ineffabilem ... nisi (adhibueris) omnes similitudines et notitias et appellationes et nomina, quae nobis veritatem confessionis nostrae declarant et confirmant, ut discamus et doceamur hanc unionem adorandam eum omni certitudine et fide infallibili" (versio p. 203,2-7.10-13).

¹²⁶ I put Vaschalde's line numbers in the quote.

¹²⁷ "Non admixtam et immixtam" negate μίξις (ܡܝܟܣܝܬܐ) and κρᾶσις (ܟܪܝܣܝܬܐ).

The miracle of Christological union is also the reason why, in the Christological case, these termini all interpret each other:

"Aliud quidem est vestimentum, et aliud templum, et aliud adhaesio, et aliud unio. Hic autem haec omnia sunt in omnibus¹²⁸ per prodigium stupendum et mirabile et ineffabile. Ita enim homo domini nostri appellatus est (sc. vestimentum et templum), non solum ad significandum quod divinitas non est in distantia ab humanitate, sed et quod humanitas eius personam divinitatis sumpsit non in distantia sicut legatus, sed coniuncte, et quod etiam proprietates divinitatis et humanitatis eius servantur sine confusione, et quod unio non est per compositionem, nec necessaria" (versio p. 191,28-37).

The miracle is the unity of the person of the infinite God and the *f i n i t e* human nature, in which the Logos does not lose his infinity; thus, in this person-forming way, he dwells only in Jesus in a human being visible to us (versio p. 204,25-27). With some astonishment one realizes that

Babai is now ready to speak of "becoming" (ܒܥܡܐ), lines 30-32: "ille *factus est* is, ... et is *factus est ille*" ("ille" is the "Son of God", "is" the "Son of Man"). The ever-present Antiochian unease towards the ἐγένετο of Joh.

1,14 had, if anything, intensified since Philoxenus had made this "becoming" the central piece of his Christology. What matters in our passage is the *statement of identity* together with its foundation in the *union* of natures, not in nature (lines 30 f. and 32 f.); since the union of natures is the one prosopon, which is simply presupposed here (line 33 f.), identity is founded in the unity of the person¹²⁹. This in turn is analyzed as an exchange of prosopa or names; this is demonstrated in a parallel to our quotation, in the context of which, however, there is an explicit polemic against the "factus est"! In chapter 20, in which Babai speaks about the names of Christ, it says (textus p. 213,27-214,10; versio p. 173,6-20):

"Forma dei formam servi sumpsit, et factus est in similitudine hominum, et habitu inventus est ut homo", et *non 'factus est'* homo; et formam sumpsit, et non forma factus est; et in similitudinem factus est, et non natura humana factus est. E persona autem unionis¹³⁰, sicut dixi, et quemadmodum unitae sunt naturae ad unam personam oeconomiae, servatis proprietatibus suis absque confusione, sic unita sunt personaliter etiam nomina naturarum, quae sua vicissim commutant, non secundum naturam, sed in assumptione personae unita¹³¹: filius altissimi (est)

¹²⁸ Vaschalde translates ܡܕܠܚܕܐ from textus p. 235,28 as "omnino" (by analogy with ܡܕܠܚܕܐ).

¹²⁹ So just a little earlier, where Babai explains how the ordinary relation of garment and clothed differs from the Christological one: Ordinarily "vestimentum non habitat in eo qui illud induit, nec unitur cum eo in una persona ita ut personaliter vestimentum sit induens, et induens sit vestimentum, in una virtute et voluntate etcetera" (versio p. 203,18-21).

¹³⁰ Vaschalde translates the stat. constr. formation (on this problem see above p. 306 n. 1 [here in this volume p. 123 note 49]) as "ratione autem unionis".

¹³¹ Vaschalde refers "unita" to "persona", which is also grammatically correct, but seems difficult to me in terms of content.

filius hominis, et filius hominis (est) filius altissimi, e persona unionis¹³² enim et adhaesione et habitatione, dum [341] filius altissimi manet in suis naturaliter et homine suo indutus est, et est cum eo in unione unus filius altissimi; et homo domini nostri est homo secundum naturam suam in ipsa unione".

The "factus est" from the end of the 21st chapter cannot be fully reconciled with this text, but the qualification (versio p. 204,30-32) "secundum unionem, non secundum naturam ... secundum unionem, non secundum naturam" must at least be taken into account. It determines the identity statement and thus also the aspect under which a "factus est" can be stated for Babai.

V Conclusion: Babai's basic religious attitude

In chapter 9, Babai celebrates the holder of the Chair of Peter, to whom Eutyches and Dioscorus owe their downfall (versio p. 61, 27 ff.), as "Leo mirabilis" (textus p. 76,13; versio p. 61,35). In this Babai can feel covered by the authority of Nestorius in the *Liber Heraclidis*¹³³, where Leo I is praised unreservedly. Nestorius was known to have been sent the *Tomus ad Flavianum* (Lib. Her., versio Nau p. 298), or more precisely: a part of it (Nau p. 330), and praised God for the impeccable orthodoxy of the Roman Church, although he had not received any kindness from there (textus BEDJAN p. 466, 16 f.; versio NAU p. 298,21-23). Nestorius regarded Leo's decision against Eutyches and in favor of Flavian as downright inspired (Bedjan p. 472,20-473,1; Nau p. 302,10-12).

Babai, for his part, makes astonishingly frequent use of the leonic-chalcedonian formula "salva igitur proprietate utriusque naturae",¹³⁴ and of the four famous chalcedonian [342] adverbs, ἀουχῦτως appears again and again. Hand in hand with the use of this vocabulary goes a religious attitude towards the Christological fact that is surprisingly similar to that of Philoxenus: the unity of the two natures in Christ is regarded as a *miracle*. That is why it is not entirely fair for Babai to compare the Christological concept of miracles of the

¹³² Vaschalde translates the stat. constr. formation here as "propter unionem"; see n. 2 [here in this volume p. 148 note 130].

¹³³ Cf. above p. 298 f. and 301 [here in this volume p. 117 f. and 119 f.], where certain astonishing statements of Babai can only be explained by the use of the *Liber Heraclidis* together with all its spurious components.

¹³⁴ Textus p. 57,14-17 (versio p. 46,11-14); 60,19-21 (48,33-35); 75,22 f. (61,13 f. Cyrill); 98 (sic),15-17 (79:16-18); 86:10-14 (80:20-23); 88:14-20 (82:19-24); 91:24 f. (85:6 f.); 110:15 f. (89:14-16); 120:13 f. (97:10 f.); 123:9 f. (99:17 f.); 123:13-18 (99:21-25); 166:20 f. (134:28 f.); 201:3-6 (162:27-29); 209:20-23 (169:20-22); 210:11-13 (170:4-6); 211:25-27 (171:14 f.); 211:28-30 (171:16-18); 213:4-6 (172:18-20); 214:1 f. (173, 11 f.); 234,5 f. (191,8 f.); 236,2-4 (191,35-37); 248,23 f. (202,2 f.); 262, [342] 11-14 (212,28-31); 262,25 f. (213,4); 268,1 f. (217,1 f.); 272,14-16 (220,17 f.); 276,24-26 (223,33 f.); 298,27 f. (241,12 f.).

Philoxenus rebukes¹³⁵, even if it is clear what he finds offensive about it: not the miracle, but *what* is described as a miracle, namely the "becoming" of the God Logos. Babai talks incessantly about the inexpressibility, inscrutability and incomprehensibility of Christological unity. It is the "how" of the union of the infinite in the finite that goes beyond all understanding (c. 6, versio p. 30,12 ff.; c. 17, versio p. 134, 31 ff.)¹³⁶. The same applies to the relationship between the three Trinitarian hypostases (c.5). All this belongs in the context of the religious attitude to the task of theology in general, i.e. to the relationship between faith and research, in which faith has absolute priority. This is why the first chapter of "De unione" deals with faith as an introduction (further considerations on faith and research can be found in chapters 2 and 3). Philoxenus defines the relationship between faith and research in a very similar way¹³⁷. De Halleux would like to attribute similarities of this kind to the familiarity with Ephrem's theology that can be assumed for both theologians¹³⁸. However, I would like to go one step further: precisely because the Syrian monophysitism of Philoxenus did not neglect the indigenous tradition from the time before the schism, this was a motive for the strict dyophysitism of the Syrian Antiochians to insist on the continuity of this tradition.

On the foundation of a firm faith and the keeping [343] of the commandments¹³⁹ meditative ascent¹⁴⁰ is possible through "silent thinking" "beyond everything explorable" into the realm of Trinitarian and Christological relations (c. 6, versio p. 31), under this condition one may "dare to research" there. In this way, Babai allows himself to make his sometimes highly "technical" considerations about Christology without violating the principle of the primacy of faith and the right Christian life. However, he never loses sight of the fact that the subject of his book is: the "*unio adoranda et ineffabilis*".

¹³⁵ ABRAMOWSKI, *Christologie Babais*, p. 230 f. [here in this volume p. 98 f.].

¹³⁶ DE HALLEUX, *Philoxène*, p. 428 n. 22: Philoxenus was not able to distinguish between 'quod' and 'quomodo' in Ephremaeus (the Philoxenus passage explained is about the existence of God).

¹³⁷ Cf. *ibid.* p. 439 n. 53 for example.

¹³⁸ Oral communication.

¹³⁹ DE HALLEUX, *Philoxène*, p. 442 n. 63 (end), for example.

¹⁴⁰ Meditative ascent, purification, enlightenment as a prerequisite for theological discourse: Babai "De unione", versio p. 5 f.; cf. DE HALLEUX, *o.c.*, p. 437 n. 50 for example.

3 Further individual studies on Syrian church history (written after 1992)

3.1 The liturgical homily by Ps. Narses with the Mass confession and a quotation from Theodore

Abstract: The homily entitled 'Exposition of the Mysteries' (translated by Connolly from Mingana's edition of Narsai's homilies) has already been shown not to be a genuine work of Narsai. It is, however, still of interest for the history of the creed and of the liturgy. It seems to be the earliest source referring to the creed as part of the eucharist in the Church of the East. The homily paraphrases the baptismal creed of Antioch (A) and in so doing purports to render the faith of the Nicene fathers, thus confirming the broader use of the 'symbol of the 318 fathers' as established by the more recent *Symbolforschung*. Another such case is the creed explained in the synod of Išō'yahb I in 585; the relationship of this creed to A and C is cleared up. The quotation from Theodore in the homily is very characteristic of his christology, though ps-Narsai seems to have missed the point - on purpose?

The homily under discussion here bears the number 17 in Mingana's edition¹ and the number 35 in the list of homilies by this theologian known to him. The older literature quotes according to the edition, while the list numbers are preferred more recently. In order to avoid possible confusion, I will count the text as no. 35/17.

My position on the question of authenticity can already be seen from the title above. The treatise has been known as a 'liturgical homily' since Connolly's translation², where it is compiled with three other homilies, also with liturgical content, from the Narses edition. Connolly arranged the four tracts as A-D. A is 35/17, B = 39/22, C = 38/21, D = 59/32.

Connolly felt compelled to investigate the authenticity of the homily because the attribution in the [88] manuscripts is not uniform and many later authors' names appear alongside Narses. Connolly worked with the means of internal criticism,³ although he was aware of the limitations of this method.⁴ After a careful comparison of 35/17 with other speeches by Narsai, Connolly came to the following conclusion

Article note: The author wishes to thank Dr. J. F. Coakley who kindly transferred the type-written manuscript of this paper on to his PC.

¹ A. Mingana, *Narsai Doctoris Syri Homiliae et Carmina*, 2 vols. (Mosul: Imprimerie Dominicaine, 1905).

² R. H. Connolly, *The liturgical homilies of Narsai* (Texts and Studies, VIII.1; Cambridge: University Press, 1909), Homily A = 35/17: 1-32, I have largely refrained from capitalizing certain words in quotations from Connolly.

³ *Homilies of Narsai*, xv.

⁴ *Ibid*, xvi.

Result: 'The foregoing evidence points to the conclusion that the writer of A was Narsai himself' and not an author of the 13th century, as some manuscripts indicate.⁵ Connolly was critical of the manuscript basis of Mingana's edition as a whole: 'The account which Fr. Mingana gives of his MSS is not very precise',⁶ which is then presented in detail; Connolly found the special notes on 35/17 'somewhat puzzling'.⁷

In the meantime, S. Y. H. Jammo has been able to name 22 manuscripts for our homily in his study on the structure of the Chaldean Mass (1979)^{8,9} He argues well against Rahmani's thesis,¹⁰ which sees various Byzantine influences at work in 35/17; for the rest, Jammo maintains its authenticity. Jammo is obviously not aware of the unpublished Roman dissertation by F. G. McLeod from 1968,¹¹ in which the authenticity is disputed.

The decisive step in the question of authenticity is due to S. Brock. In his study of word formation in Syriac and how it can be used to date anonymous texts,¹² he concludes for our homily: 'We will discover that the presence of certain tell-tale adjectival forms in *-aya* and *-anaya* makes it very unlikely that the memra can really be from the pen of Narsai'. Brock lists the corresponding forms, establishes their uniqueness in the corpus of Narsai's writings published to date and offers their datable attestation in other authors (Cyrus of Edessa and Babai the Great). 'There would thus seem to be good reason for dating the homily to some time subsequent to Narsai, perhaps to the sixth century (rather than to Abdisho' of Elam in the thirteenth)'.¹³

[89] Judith Frishman gives an overview in her 1992 dissertation on Narsai¹⁴. The following is an overview of the discussion to date regarding the authenticity of 35/17.¹⁵ The

⁵ Ibid, xxxviii.

⁶ Ibid, xi.

⁷ Ibid, xiii.

⁸ S. Y. H. Jammo, *La structure de la messe chaldéenne du début jusqu'à l'anaphore. Étude historique* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 207; Rome: 1979).

⁹ Ibid, 14-15.

¹⁰ Ibid, 19-24. about insertions in the text, 25.

¹¹ F. G. McLeod, 'The soteriology of Narsai' (dissertation, Rome, 1968). I am grateful to Dr. Judith Frishman, Leiden, for the great trouble she has kindly taken to enable me to use this work.

¹² S. Brock, 'Diachronic aspects of Syriac word formation: an aid for dating anonymous texts', in *V. Symposium Syriacum* 1988 (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 236; Rome, 1990), 321-30.

¹³ Ibid, 327-8.

¹⁴ J. Frishman, 'The ways and means of the divine economy. An edition, translation and study of six biblical homilies by Narsai' (dissertation, Leiden, 1992).

¹⁵ Ibid., 12-14 of the third part (the three parts of the book unfortunately have separate paginations). On 13 n. 100 I note that the *one* Christological hypostasis from the Sachau text of Theodore of Mopsuestia cannot be considered authentic, but is an adaptation. Cf. now L. Abramowski, *Die Reste der syrischen Übersetzung von Theodor von Mopsuestia, De incarnatione*, in

For her part, the author can contribute a small list of expressions¹⁶ that she did not find in the real Narses, the conclusion being that the speech was not written by Narses either in whole or in part.

If we combine the number of stylistic and representational similarities between our text and the genuine Narses homilies, as Connolly lists them, with the observations of McLeod, Brock and Frishman, then it emerges that the author has consciously and successfully followed the school of Narsai, but through the anachronisms of word formation (Brock) betrays himself as an imitator, albeit a very talented one.

I myself noticed a further difference between 35/17 and the three other liturgical homilies, namely with regard to the liturgical personnel. While 35/17, 'Explanation of the Mysteries', speaks of several priests and deacons, among whom one priest is chosen as celebrant (Mingana, i. 272-3, Connolly, 3-4), 38/21 (C in Connolly), 'On the Mysteries of the Church and on Baptism', always mentions only one priest and once two deacons next to him (Mingana, i. 350, Connolly, 55), - this within the description of baptism and its interpretation. No liturgical passages are quoted in the description of this sacrament, but they are quoted in the subsequent description of the Eucharistic liturgy. A profession of faith is not included (in contrast to 35/17!). Hom. 39/22

'On Baptism' (B in Connolly) mentions the profession of faith in connection with *baptism*, whereby *renunciation* and confession are always combined (Connolly, 36, 38, 44); in terms of content, only the confession to the Creator or to the Godhead is mentioned on these occasions: the baptized person renounces Satan in order to turn to the Creator. The *form* of the baptismal confession in question can therefore not be deduced from 39/22.

Our homily 35/17 is of great interest in terms of symbolic history and therefore also liturgical history¹⁷, and this in [90] three respects: firstly because of the use of a confession in the Eucharistic service, secondly because of the type of confession thus used, and thirdly because of the author's designation of the confession as Nicene¹⁸.

The second point has already been clarified by Connolly, who recognized that here the 'Nestorianum', so called since Caspari, is reproduced in free form.

add. 14.669, Aram 5, 1.2 (published 1996 = *Festschrift* Sebastian P. Brock), 23-32 [here in this volume S. 29-36].

¹⁶ Ways and means', 14.

¹⁷ Connolly himself conducts the following liturgical-historical studies: 'The rite of baptism in Narsai's homilies' (xlII-xlIX); 'The formula of renunciation in Narsai's baptismal rite' (xlIX); 'Narsai's liturgy and the existing Nestorian rites' (l-lxxI).

¹⁸ In his catecheses held in Antioch, Theodore also regards the symbol he explained there as Nicene. Cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *Altchristliche Glaubensbekenntnisse* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 345: The term 'the faith of the 318 Fathers' was unspecific and was also used habitually for C, even as late as the 6th century.

19 To my knowledge, the first point has not yet been considered in the treatment of our homily. However, 35/17 is probably the first evidence that the baptismal confession was also introduced into the Eucharistic liturgy of the Syriac-speaking Dyophysite Church of Persia (there does not seem to be any explicit mention of this). The claim to Nicene orthodoxy for the confession (see point 3 above) should be used to assess this phenomenon. In this context, the question of the authenticity of 35/17 takes on a liturgical-historical significance in addition to its literary-historical significance, since the dating of the text is linked to the question of the author. If Narses was the author, the Credo would have been inserted into the liturgy of the Mass in his ecclesiastical domain surprisingly early, before 502, the generally accepted date of Narsai's death. If the homily is attributed to Narses with good reason, we lose a fixed *terminus ad quem* for the insertion and are also led into the period after Narses.

A relative time reference can be obtained from the remarks of the author of our homily, which follow the reproduction of the symbol. It says:

'This did *the 318 priests seal*; and they proscribed and anathematized every one that confesses not according to their confession' - the 318 priests are, of course, the fathers of Nicaea. 'The church confesses according to the confession of the fathers,²⁰ and she

cites²¹ *their confession also at the time of the mysteries*' ܐܠܐ ܠܝܫܬܝܬ ܕܐܬܝܬ ܕܡܝܫܬܝܬ (ܐܠܐ ܠܝܫܬܝܬ ܕܐܬܝܬ ܕܡܝܫܬܝܬ Mingana, 275, Connolly, 6). The last sentence I have emphasized speaks

This indicates that the citation of the Credo in the Eucharistic service was not yet an ancient matter of course, otherwise it would not have been necessary to specifically point this fact out to the canons of the priesthood to whom the homily is addressed²². It [91] can therefore be assumed that this liturgical innovation was not too long ago. But when did it occur?

In his book on the early Christian creeds, he discusses J. N. D. Kelly²³, the news we have about the same process first in Antioch and then in Constantinople, where this development, which also gradually occurred in the Latin West, apparently originated. For Kelly it is unquestionable that not only in Constantinople but also in Antioch²⁴ the Nicaeno

¹⁹ *Homilies of Narsai*, lxxi-lxxvi.

²⁰ This refers to those of Nicaea.

²¹ Connolly says 'employs'.

²² Cf. beginning and end of the homily: 'Come, then, o son of the divine mystery, hear the record - marvelous to tell - of the mysteries of the church' (1); 'Come then, o son of mystery of the sons of the church, learn the order by which thou mayest draw nigh to the priesthood ...' (31).

²³ What Jammo, *La messe chaldéenne*, 188, says about this was already outdated when his book was published. Jammo's 'Gaspari' refers to Caspari.

²⁴ Kelly is to be agreed with when he (344) against Capelle does not regard the two reports on the introduction of the confession into the Eucharistic liturgy as mutually exclusive and also does not regard the report on the events in Constantinople as mutually exclusive because of the eyewitness testimony of the reporter.

Constantinopolitanum (= C) was introduced into the liturgy, hence its title 'C in the liturgy of the Lord's Supper' for the relevant section.²⁵ This is certainly correct for Constantinople, but is it also compelling for Antioch? After all, Antioch had a baptismal creed that was very similar to C and was considered Nicene in its content: the Antiochenum, which we know was still in use in Antioch in 428. Should it have already been superseded by the pure C at the time of the Antichalcedonian Peter Fullo, who was the first to prescribe that the confession was to be spoken 'in every synaxis'?

The above-mentioned news about what Kelly calls 'a revolutionary innovation'²⁶ in the history of the liturgy comes from the Church History of Theodorus Lector or Anagnostes, or more precisely from what is still left of this Church History. Kelly and, accordingly, Jammo were still dependent on Migne's text. Since 1971, the critical edition of Theodorus Anagnostes has been published in the 'Griechische Christliche Schriftstellern' by

G. C. Hansen, whose counting of fragments and paragraphs is now authoritative. It turns out that the liturgical measures of Peter Fullo in Antioch²⁷ are mentioned in two places in the Epitome of Church History; the insertion of the symbol into the synaxis is mentioned in both places. § 427 (118) reports on Peter's Christological addition to the Trishagion and how the Chalcedonian patriarch Calandius, for his part, tried to make it theologically tolerable by a further addition [92] and that Peter, when he was again patriarch, deleted the Calandius addition again. (The addition of Calandius is mentioned again in § 545, 155.) The news of this back and forth is followed by § 428 (118, 27-8): 'Peter the Walker thought that in the divine services the symbol should always be spoken which had not been spoken before'.

The second passage collects the liturgical innovations of Peter Fullo, § 547 (115, 17-20): 'He says that Peter the Walker devised that the anointing oil should be consecrated in the church in the presence of all the people, and that the epiclesis over the waters at Epiphany should be done in the evening, and that the Theotokos should be named in every prayer'. In his notes²⁸ Kelly refers to a small work by B. Capelle, which is difficult to access, and which denies the authorship of the present § 428 by Theodor Anagnostes on the grounds that the note is written as follows

the only reliable one. I think it is conceivable that Peter Fullo's measure and the *custom that* has existed in Antioch ever since provided the model for the imperial capital, especially since here too the initiative came from an Antichalcedonian. Relations between the Antichalcedonians of the two large cities were extremely close.

²⁵ *Creeds*, 343.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Peter the Walker (Gnapheus, Fullo) was Patriarch of Antioch several times: 471, 475-7, 485-8; died 488.

²⁸ *Creeds*, 343 n. 1 and 344 n. 3.

very isolated. Capelle does not seem to have mentioned the present § 547. I do not even think it necessary to delete the message as a superfluous duplicate in one of the two places, since the intervention of Kalandius in the extended Trishagion is also reported twice (see above).

The section of Theodore Anagnostes on the events in Constantinople under the Antichalcedonian Timotheus (511-518) analyzed by Kelly is § 501 (143, 16-19) of the Epitome:

Timothy arranged that the symbol of the faith of the 318 fathers should be *recited* in every service, (this served him) namely (also) to slander Macedonius, as if he had not accepted the symbol, which was previously recited (only) once a year, on the holy Friday of the Divine Passion on the occasion of the episcopal catechesis.

Kelly rightly draws attention to the interesting fact that it is anti-Chalcedonian hierarchs who insert the baptismal creed into the Eucharistic service in the two eastern centers of the empire. His definition of the motif is also correct: emphasizing the orthodoxy of one's own (party) point of view by regularly citing the (in my opinion: customary) 'Nicene'. The fact that at the next 'change of confession' at the Constantinople Thronos 518 (Timothy is replaced by John) the symbol is not deleted again in the Synaxis is not only due to the fact that the liturgy has become accustomed to this form in the meantime, but in my opinion also to the fact that the invocation of the 'Niceneum' in this liturgical form could not or did not want to be left to the Antichalcedonians. Precisely the same motive must also have led to the insertion of the 'Nicene' symbol into the [93] synaxis of the Dyophysite church of the Persian Empire.

Unfortunately, the information in Theodorus Lektor does not help us with the question of dating: we have no way of determining the age of the Ps. Narses Homily by the date of the liturgical innovation among the Persian Dyophysites, because we do not know this date, but are rather dependent on drawing an approximate conclusion from the rather vague dating of the homily (see above) as to the time of the liturgical change.

It was the excursus in which G. L. Dossetti outlines the history of the confession declared by Theodore in his catechisms,²⁹ which prompted me to deal with the Ps. narses homily. For Theodore's confession as the confession of the Church of Antioch, first the Nicene, Meletian, and then the Church united with the Old Nicenes, and for the relationship of this confession

²⁹ G. L. Dossetti, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Constantinopoli. Edizione critica* (Rome: Herder, 1967). The excursus can be found as n. 24, 278-81.

I refer the reader to my 1992 study on the confession of C.30 The confession should be called *Antiochenum*; the confession called 'Nestorianum' since Caspari is nothing other than this *Antiochenum*. Caspari's name derives from the place where he found the text; he could not yet have known Theodore's catecheses.³¹ What is known from Euseb (of Doryläum) and John Cassian as the 'old' confession of the Church of Antioch are deliberately edited excerpts from the *Antiochenum*. The older definitions of dependence are therefore outdated.

Dossetti hypothesizes³² that Caspari found the text of the 'Nestorianum'. nel quadro della Liturgia battesimale nestoriana composta dal catholicos Išō'yahb III (647-c. 658); infatti [94] il simbolo che vi compare è, a giudicare della versione tedesca di G. Diettrich, *Die nestorianische Tauf liturgie*, Giessen 1903, p. 31 s. identico al nostro'. This last point is correct; but as far as the manuscript location is concerned, we find quite detailed information in Caspari that makes Dossetti's supposition superfluous. Caspari reports that he took the text from a copy made for him by a Bamberg colleague, Dr. Schönfelder. The source of the copy was Cod. orient. 147 of the Royal Court Library in Munich, which 'contains a Nestorian breviary'.³³ In the annotation³⁴ to it Caspari says:

It is the same codex from which Abbot Prof. Dr. Haneberg in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgen- ländischen Gesellschaft* B. III p. 231 ff. three Nestorian hymns, one by Theodor of Mopsvestia, one by Narses and one by Babaeus (Babai). Dr. Haneberg remarks there (p. 232) about the codex as follows: 'It (the Nestorian Breviary) contains from fol. 1-87 the Psalter; from there to the end of fol. 138 various hymns, sequences, antiphons, orations, with the indication whether they are to be sung on weekdays or Sundays, whether at Matins or Vespers. etc. are to be prayed for'.

³⁰ L. Abramowski, 'Was hat das Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum (C) mit dem Konzil von Konstantinopel 381 zu tun?', *Theologie und Philosophie*, 67 (1992), 481-513 [here in this volume pp. 331-362 - d. Editor].

³¹ Caspari's incomparable familiarity with the baptismal and other confessions, which all later writers draw on (or fall short of, if they have not read him), allowed him to indicate the symbolic-historical trajectory of the colon 'Spirit of Truth' from the III. The New Testament phrase (John 15:16; cf. 14:17) appears in the Third Antiochene Formula, in the symbol of the Third Synod of Sirmium, in the symbol of Nike and of Constantinople 360, in Basil the Great and in the symbol read by the presbyter Charisius in Ephesus 431. Cf. C. P. Caspari, 'Das Taufbekenntnis der Nestorianer aus Cod. orient. 147 of the Königliche Hofbibliothek zu München', 132. The study thus titled is no. V, 113-42 in the volume *Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel* (vol. I, Christiania, 1866). Incidentally, the free rendering of the Antiochene in our Ps. narses homily lacks the equivalent of this colon. S. Connolly, *Homilies*, lxxiv, left column.

³² Dossetti, *Il simbolo*, 279 below.

³³ Caspari, 'Confession of Baptism', 115.

³⁴ Ibid, 115 n. 2.

Haneberg also explains the Nestorian origin of the manuscript. It was written in 1608. According to Schönfelder, the baptismal symbol appears on f. 94b of the manuscript.

Dr. Haneberg further notes that the name Theodorus has been erased in the inscription of the hymn by Theodor von Mopsveste, and that the name of this forerunner of Nestorianism was treated in exactly the same way at the beginning of the manuscript, except that here it has been replaced by a glued-on strip of paper, while the expression 'blessed, holy', remained crossed out there, and concludes from this that the manuscript fell into the hands of Jacobites or Catholics and then returned to Nestorians.

Caspari counters Haneberg's judgment with his own, which is undoubtedly the correct one:

Since in the third article of the Baptismal Creed the words '*who goes forth*' are accompanied by the addition
'und vom Sohne' ... (whether above the words or in the margin Dr. Schönfelder could not tell me), so the manuscript can only have been in the hands of unirr Nestorians and returned from them into the hands of non-unirr ones.

Dossetti cites our Ps. Narses Homily as the earliest attestation of the Antiochene after Theodore's catechesis, but he considers it to be genuine³⁵ with corresponding consequences for its dating), [95] which had not yet been questioned by me at the time.³⁶

While the Antiochenum in Ps. Narses 35/17 as a symbol of the Mass, it is used in a different way on the next occasion known to us. The Synod of the Persian Church of 585 under Išō'yahb I places it at the head of its canons, 'diluito però in un commento dogmatico (Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale*, Paris 1902, testo siriano p. 133-136, trad. francese p. 393-398). Il testo che si lascia ricostruire è il nostro, però molto assimilato a C, e con alla fine gli anathematismi di Nicea.'³⁷ Dossetti's judgment is more accurate than that of Brock, who describes the annotated symbol as 'the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed', but concedes: 'there seem to be some reminiscences of Theodore's commentary'.³⁸ In fact, however, the annotated symbol is a deliberate combination of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed and the Theodore-Constantinopolitan creed.

³⁵ *Il simbolo*, 279-80.

³⁶ Abramowski, 'Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum', 512 [here in this volume p. 360 - *the editor*]. I hereby present the study I announced there.

³⁷ *Il simbolo*, 280.

³⁸ S. Brock, 'The christology of the Church of the East in the Synods of the fifth to early seventh century: preliminary considerations and materials', in *Aksum-Thyateira. Festschrift Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain* (Athens, 1985), 125-42; I cite 136 n. 64. The article translates the findings of the synods in question into English and precedes them with an introduction which, in addition to historical information, contains a differentiating characterization of the theological trends of the time. On the synod of 585, cf. 127 (no. 6), translation of the long dogmatic declaration, 136-8.

from the Antiochenum and C, i.e. from two common and in any case closely related 'Nicene' confessions; the addition of the anathemata from the old Niceneum of 325, i.e. from N, is intended to emphasize the Nicene character and thus the orthodoxy once again.

In his translation³⁹, Chabot has divided the individual colas of the confessional text are emphasized in italics; the author has made this possible through his introductory formulas. The author also explicitly says that he 'put down the symbol of the Fathers, tel qu'il est', adding a short commentary to each sentence. Before that, he had invoked the 318 Fathers of Nicaea and the 150 of Byzantium (Chabot, Übers., 394). As a kind of heading for his explanation of the creed, he places the first cola of each of the three articles:⁴⁰

- [96] I Nous croyons en un seul Dieu
 Père tout-puissant,
 II et en un seul Seigneur, Jésus-Christ,
 Fils de Dieu,
 III et un seul⁴¹ Esprit-Saint
 qui procède du Père

The interpretation emphasizes the threefold 'seul' (394-5). The (only at the beginning not quite) complete text looks like this:

- (395) I 1 (...) un seul Dieu
 2 (...) tout puissant
 3 créateur de toutes choses, visibles et invisibles
 IIa 4 en un seul Seigneur Jésus-Christ
 (396) 5 (...) unique
 6 et premier-né de toutes les créatures
 7 par lequel ont été constitués les mondes et créés toutes choses
 8 qui a été engendré de son Père avant tous les siècles,
 9 et qui n'a pas été fait;
 10 lumière de la lumière
 11 Dieu vrai de Dieu vrai,

39 Chabot considers the Confession to be C (thus 394 n. 3), but adds: 'Néanmoins il semble y avoir quelques légères différences entre le texte qui a passé en syriaque, et celui qui est donné dans les collections conciliaires'; he prints the text of C in this note. P. 396 nn. 1 and 3, Chabot noted the presence of the two biblical passages Col. 1:15 and Heb. 1:3 (characteristic of Antioch) in the text of the Confession. Caspari's works are obviously unknown to Chabot. **40** The structure and the numbering of the three articles with Roman numerals by me, also below the line numbering in the complete version.

41 'Un seul' in the Holy Spirit from Antiochenum; according to Theodore it is taken from the Roman Confession, for which I have suggested the term Romano-Nicaenum; see Abramowski, 'Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum', 498 [here in this volume p. 348 - *the editor*].

- | | | | |
|-------|------|----|---|
| | | 12 | ὁμοούσιον au Père |
| | | 13 | par lequel tout a été fait |
| | IIb | 14 | celui qui pour nous autres hommes |
| | | 15 | et pour notre salut est descendu du ciel |
| | | 16 | a pris un corps de l'Esprit-Saint et de Marie la Vierge et s'est fait homme |
| | | 17 | et il fut crucifié pour nous du temps de Ponce-Pilate, |
| | | 18 | il a souffert, |
| | | 19 | est mort, |
| | | 20 | a été enseveli |
| | | 21 | et est resuscité le troisième jour, comme disent les Livres saints |
| | | | et il monta au cieux |
| | | 22 | et il est assis à la droite de son Père. |
| | | 23 | Et il viendra dans la gloire |
| | | 24 | juger les vivants et les morts, |
| | | 25 | celui don't le royaume n'aura pas fin. |
| | | 26 | Et en un seul Esprit-Saint, |
| [97] | IIIa | 27 | seigneur, vivificateur, |
| | | 28 | qui procède du Père, |
| | | 29 | qui est adoré avec le Père et le Fils, |
| | | 30 | qui a parlé par les Prophètes et les Apôtres. |
| | | 31 | Et en une seule Église, sainte, catholique et apostolique |
| (398) | IIIb | 32 | et en un ⁴² seul baptême pour la rémission des péchés, |
| | | 33 | et en la résurrection des morts, et en la vie nouvelle dans le |
| | | 34 | siècle futur. |

The formulation with which the Nicene anathemata are connected shows that the author regards the preceding as a 'Niceneum': 'Après avoir ainsi abondamment et complètement prêché la vérité, ils (sc. les Pères) se mettent ensuite à anathématiser Arius et les partisans de son erreur ...' (398).

In order to clarify the actual relationships between this confession, the Antiocheneum and C, I make an individual comparison. For this I take the Antiocheneum as a basis (A) in the structure and numbering that I have given elsewhere.⁴³ I note only deviations from A, whether in the order of the cola or in the textual material; the nature of the relationship to C will also be admitted - the reader is asked to consult the structured text of C as well,⁴⁴

⁴² Chabot omitted 'un' by mistake.

⁴³ 'Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum', 513 [here in this volume p. 361 f. - *the editor*].

⁴⁴ Ibid, 512-13 [here in this volume p. 361 - *the editor*].

if he wants to arrive at a more concrete view from my explanations and conclusions.

	6	=	A 6 (Col. 1:15)
	7	=	A 11! (cf. Heb 1:3)
	8	=	A 7
	9	=	A 8
	10	fro	C (without equivalent in A)
		m	
	11	=	A 9
	13	=	C (without equivalent in A, but cf. 7 = A 11)
	16	=	C (cf. a 16)
	17	=	C (cf. A 17)
	18	=	C (without equivalent in A)
	19	!	(neither in A nor in C)
	24	=	C (cf. A 22)
	26	=	C (without equivalent in A)
	A 25 is missing between 27 and 28 (πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας)		
	28	=	C (cf. A 27)
[98]	30	=	C (without equivalent in A)
	31	=	C (without equivalent in A, the 'apostles' are also missing in C, as Chabot already noted)
	32	=	C (cf. A 28)
	33	cf.	C (cf. A 29)
	34	cf.	C (cf. A 30).

The fact that A and *not* C is the starting point for the symbol of the Synod of Išo'yahb can be seen on the one hand from the retained biblical col. 1:15 and Heb. 1:3, which are characteristic of A, and from the non-existent verbs in Article IIIb. However, A has now been filled in from C, and almost all the differences to pure A can be explained in this way. *Once* we find a rearrangement: in order to be able to take over the end of article IIa from C (line 13 above), A 11 has been moved to A 6 and now appears in our confession as line 7, resulting in a shift of the other lines. The infilling is particularly noticeable in Article III on the Holy Spirit, where C has richer statements than A. Line 26 (at the end of IIb) takes over the well-known anti-Markan sentence from C, but in III the colon about the 'Spirit of truth', which would be expected after A, is deleted. The aforementioned additions from C explain why our confession can appear at first glance to be a slightly modified C. The author of this combination of A with C is certainly Išo'yahb I. myself.

Finally, the quotation from Theodore of Mop-suestia contained in Homily 35/17 deserves our attention. Although Connolly did not overlook it, it has not been considered since then (but see the corrective below); therefore it is also missing in

Correction: In the meantime I realize that the quotation from Theodore has not been completely overlooked. W. F. Macomber discovered a parallel without any indication of the author in the explanation of the Passover of Cyrus of Edessa, see his edition and translation in CSCO 355-6 (Syr. 155-6; 1974): there 57-8/49-50, 49 f., plus the notes and the references in the introduction. Macomber has also devoted a contribution to the two text versions in the *Mélanges F. Graffin*: 'An anaphora[] prayer [composed] by Theodore of Mopsuestia', *Parole de l'Orient*, 6/7 (1975-76), 341-7.

3.2 On the writings of Michael Malpana / Badoqa

In the helpful Quellenkunde, which is part of volume 2/1 of A. Grillmeier's great Christological work¹, there are among the collections of definitions of the "The Book of Definitions and Subdivisions" by Michael Malpana or Badoqa², published, translated and annotated by G. Furlani in 1926³. Another text by Michael was edited and translated in 1972 as part (No. III) of the "Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts"⁴. It is a *draša*, a "dispute", which the two editors have not rendered accurately enough as a "treatise"⁵.

The Patrologia Syriaca by I. Ortiz de Urbina in the first edition of 1958 knows nothing of Furlani's edition (in the second edition of 1965 it is no different)⁶ and also says nothing about the chronological difficulties⁷ mentioned by Baumstark, of course, and known for a long time, which are connected with the author attribution Michael Malpana for the "Book of Definitions". In the catalog of the printed [2] Syrian Books of the British Museum by C. Moss (1962), Furlani's work appears in the impressive list of his works as a cross-reference to Michael Badoqa⁸.

Now, in preparation for the section on the Christology of the "Early Church of the East" (the so-called Nestorians), which will be published in volume 2/3 of Grillmeier's above-mentioned

¹ A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* 2/1, Freiburg etc. 1986, 22-103.

² Ibid. 98 f. - When transcribing Syriac words, I refrain from marking long vowels, even within quotations from secondary literature.

³ G. Furlani, "'Il libro delle definizioni e divisioni' di Michele l'interprete", *Atti della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, serie 6, vol. 2 (1926), 5-194.

⁴ L. Abramowski and A. E. Goodman (eds.), *A Nestorian collection of christological texts*, 2 vols., Cambridge 1972. On the Michael text vol. 11, xxxiv f., the Syriac text vol. I, 105-113, the English translation vol. 11, 61-65.

⁵ "Treatise" vol. II, 61,20, also 65,40 (colophon). The lemma of text no. IV also has "treatise", 66,1, where "dispute" would be more correct. - In the collection of definitions edited by Furlani, no. 149 deals with *draša*, which Furlani correctly translates as "La disputa". The definition begins (Furlani 123):

"La disputa è un esame e un'investigazione di qualcosa sulla quale verte divergenza e controversia, come la dualità delle nature del Messia e la dualità delle sue ipostasi in una persona dell'economia (divina)". This is one of the passages in the collection that identifies its author as a Nestorian. The text goes on to distinguish four types of disputes. The preceding provision, no. 148, is called 'enyana, "conversation", it can take place orally or in writing and serves the exchange of ideas - the contentious "dispute" is thus clearly distinguished from it.

⁶ I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Patrologia syriaca*, Rome 1958, 125 § 69; Michael magister Nisibenus; in the 2nd edition 134 § 70.

⁷ A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn 1922, 129.

⁸ C. Moss, *Catalogue of Syriac printed books and related literature in the British Museum*, London 1962, 375 and 745.

presentation, it was desirable to gain an impression of this extensive work under the name of Michael.

Older research had already come to the conclusion that the "Book of Definitions" could not have been written by a Michael who worked at the school of Nisibis at the time of Henana in the function indicated by his epithets and who then belonged to those who left the school in protest against Henana⁹. Because of the sources used, the "Book of Definitions" cannot belong to the period around 600, in which Michael Malpana is to be placed. Therefore, the solution was to declare a bishop of the same name from around 900 as the author¹⁰, an assumption that Furlani also follows¹¹.

In fact, the attribution to Michael Malpana or Badoqa must be regarded as secondary, which eliminates the embarrassment of finding a Michael who corresponds to the approximate dating given by the fixed *terminus a quo*. Although the attribution to the apparently quite famous "teacher Michael" appears in the late Hsl. However, it does not appear in the two oldest manuscripts discussed by Furlani, one of which was only discovered by Furlani in the first place¹² (it was still unknown to Baumstark). Fortunately, the lemmata and colophons reported by Furlani make it possible to explain how the attribution came about, which then led to the chronological difficulties mentioned above. Furlani did not recognize this possibility of clarifying the circumstances, and his presentation of the material [3] is not designed to make it easier for others. This also includes the fact that he does not indicate the age of the manuscripts he uses or even mentions, apart from the new one he has included, but leaves it to the reader to find the relevant data himself. For one part, Baumstark steps in with his great accuracy. Chronologically, the manuscript found by Furlani and mentioned last by him is placed at the beginning of a list based on the age of the manuscripts:

- 1) *Brit. Mus. add. 14538*, marked L by Furlani (Furl. 12 f.) and described by citing Wright's catalog. Wright dates the manuscript to "about the 10th century". (Furl. 13). The editor himself, by comparing it with the manuscript of another ms. "already" to "the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century" (ibid.). This would

⁹ On this "crisis" at the school of Nisibis led by Henana, see G. J. Reinink, "'Edessa grew dim and Nisibis shone forth': The School of Nisibis at the transition of the sixth-seventh century", in: J. W. Drijvers and A. A. MacDonald (eds.), *Centres of learning*, Leiden etc. 1995, 77-89; and the same, "Tradition and the Formation of the 'Nestorian' Identity in 6th-7th Century Iraq", in: L. Conrad (ed.), *Late Antiquity and Early Islam. Fourth Workshop: Patterns of Communal Identity (Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam)*, Princeton N. Y. 1999 (forthcoming [actually published in the journal 'Church History and Religious Culture' 89, 2009, 217-250 - the editor]).

¹⁰ Baumstark, *Geschichte*, 129, n. 2.

¹¹ Furlani, "Il libro", 194.

¹² Furlani, "Il libro", 12.

Hs. very close to the presumed date of the text's composition (which Furlani, remarkably, does not mention) and thus lends all possible information about the author a weight of which the editor is evidently unaware. The "Book of Definitions" is at the beginning of the manuscript, f. 1-11. The lemma for the entire manuscript and the subsequent lemma of its first part are preserved. But the last leaves of the "Book of Definitions" are missing; thus the colophon of this manuscript in L is unfortunately lost.

2) *Petermann* 9 (Berlin) = B (Furl. 11 f.). The manuscript was written in 1259/6013. Furlani has added it to the

He only deviated from it when a clear error was found, or when the other mss. provided a better reading (Furl. 12).

3) *India Office* 9 (London) = I. Neither here (12) nor in his earlier description of the very extensive manuscript does Furlani give its age¹⁴; therefore Baumstark does not help either, since he takes his dates from the respective catalogs or manuscript descriptions.

4) *University Library Cambridge add.* 2812 = C (Furl. 12). This manuscript is not mentioned by Baumstark, but Furlani does not specifically mention this. From the description in Wright's catalog¹⁵ we learn that the manuscript dates from the early 19th century. "Written in a good current Nestorian hand of the ^{xix}th cent. "16 "the colophon" (sc. of the whole Hs.), f. 132a, "states that the book was finished on the ²⁶th of the first Teshri, in the year 2118 = a. D. 1806, when Mar John was metropolitan, at Alfiosh, by the deacon Hormizd, son of Hanna, from the village of Piyoz. "17

[4] C is closely related to I, both must be copies from a common model. I, however, made corrections after a manuscript of type B (Furl. 12).

The editor was unable to inspect the manuscripts described by A. Scher, which were located in Near Eastern libraries (Furl. 14): *Notre-Dame des Semences* 52 (15th century)¹⁸ and 142 (from 1678/9)¹⁹, a manuscript in the monastery of Rabban Hormizd (Baumstark gives no date) and finally *Mardin* 62 (from 1887)²⁰. However, *Mardin* 62 only offers the long definition (no. 225 in Furlani's edition of the "Book of Definitions") on the dream; the "Writing on Dreams", listed by Baumstark as a separate title under Michael's name²¹, is therefore not only to be deleted as an independent writing, but also falls under the verdict of inauthenticity together with the entire "Book of Definitions", as far as Michael Badoqa as its author is concerned.

¹³ Baumstark, *Geschichte*, 129, n. 12.

¹⁴ G. Furlani, "Il manoscritto siriano 9 dell'India Office", *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 10 (1923-25), 315-320.

¹⁵ W. Wright, *A catalogue of the Syriac manuscripts preserved in the library of the University of Cambridge*, Cambridge 1901, vol. II, 635-643.

¹⁶ Wright, *Catalogue Cambridge*, 635.

¹⁷ Wright, *Catalogue Cambridge*, 643.

¹⁸ Baumstark, *Geschichte*, 129, n. 10 in connection with n. 9.

¹⁹ Baumstark, *Geschichte*, 129, n. 10. Baumstark also mentions Hs. *Brl Or oct 1132*, which belongs to the 17th / 18th century; it is not mentioned by Furlani, "Il libro", and is therefore not used.

²⁰ Baumstark, *History*, 129, n. 8.

²¹ Baumstark, *History*, 129.

Let us now look at the lemmas and colophons of the "Book of Definitions" in the chronological order of the Hss. used by Furlani. This opportunity reveals a methodological error on Furlani's part: although he correctly takes *Petermann* 9 = B as the basis of his edition (on the special position of L, see below), he does not print the lemma and colophon of B in plain text, but that of I (*India Office* 9) and refers to the corresponding lines from B in the apparatus. Anyone who only uses Furlani's Italian translation and does not have the information in the introduction (11-13) in mind cannot be aware of this fact. But the presentation of the Syriac text is not clear enough either. At its beginning, 17, for example, the marginal folio indications appear already at the lemma²², so that one might initially have the impression that the lemma is the same for all Hss. whereas in fact it is the lemma of I. The apparatus says of these lines 1-4: "1-4 I, C, L:". What follows the colophon in Syriac (4 lines and one word) is the lemma of L, as can be inferred from the introduction (13). The lemma of C is so closely related to that of I[5] that it is not listed. Accordingly, the sigla in the apparatus should have been sorted: "1-4 I (C); L:". The short lemma of B follows that of L after the Syriac major clause separator.

Furlani proceeds as follows with the colophons of the manuscripts: The author's He includes the prayer formulae of the scribes of I and C in the apparatus; the colophon of B with its different author's indication is completely banished to the apparatus; unfortunately, no colophon of L has survived due to the loss of the leaf (see above).

As already mentioned, in L the "Book of Definitions" is at the beginning of the Hs; its lemma is (Syriac 17 App.):

By the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, our true God, and by his help and grace, we begin to write this book of logic, which is collected from philosophers or sages on natural (subjects) with other things inspired from divine writings and teachers by the²³ Holy Spirit.

This is immediately followed by the lemma of the first piece in the Hs. with which the lemmata in the later Hss. are to be compared (Syr. 17 app., Italian 13):

²² At the beginning of the translation (Furlani, "Il libro", 100), the folio numbering is indicated somewhat more appropriately: it is placed after the lemma and before the beginning of the actual text, but the printing arrangement destroys the good intention again by placing the number at the end of the lemma.

²³ To be read with Reinink, whom I thank for the hint, nepihai for the spelling or printing error zapih̄ai.

First, the treatise (*memra*) of the definitions of all things with their explanations and their proper (sub)divisions, collected from the books of the philosophers *by a man who loves teaching*.

L thus leaves the collector anonymous in the lemma, but we cannot know whether this was different in the colophon because of the loss of text. The lemma of B (syr. 17 app., italien. 11)²⁴:

Again, we write a treatise (*memra*) that goes over the explanation of the definitions (concerning) all the modi, which is made *by one of the skilled teachers (malpane mhira)*. Lord, help me, wretched man, by your grace.

In this lemma, too, the collector is still anonymous. The situation is different in the colophon (syr. 99 app., italien. 11):

End of the book of definitions made *by the great father Bazud Badoqa*.

Blessed be God for ever and ever, and may his name be glorified from generation to generation²⁵.

[6] Here the collector is given a name, that of Badoqa Bazud. Furlani²⁶ certainly identifies the name Bazud correctly with that of Abzud (omission of Alaph at the beginning of the word), who is known from Ebed-Jesu as the author of a collection of definitions. The lexicon of Bar Bahlul, into which the "Book of Definitions" has entered via an intermediate stage and in the form that L offers it²⁷, quotes the definition of *qraitha* (no. 27 Furlani, "l'appellazione") under the name of Abzud. From all this Furlani draws the untenable conclusion that Michael Badoqa and Abzud are (as persons!) identical²⁸. In my opinion, the mention of the name in Bar Bahlul means that the lexicographer (also) found this definition in Abzud.

The lemma of I (syr. 17, 1-4, italien. 100 and, without introductory clause, 12):

Again, by the power of the Trinity, the beatific one, we write a treatise that (goes) over the explanation of the definitions of all modi and things with their explanations and the (sub)division of things, which is made *by Mar Michael Badoqa and practiced teacher (malpana mhira)*. Our Lord, help me through your mercy. Amen.

²⁴ Furlani says "specie" for "modi" and "celebri" for "practiced".

²⁵ Furlani translates the final petition as follows: "Benedici, Dio, il mondo che loda il Tuo nome in eterno."

²⁶ Furlani, "Il libro", 189 and 10. Furlani claims 189, n. 2, that Baumstark, *Geschichte*, 129, contradicts the identification; but Baumstark doubts the attribution of the text rather than the identification of the name forms.

²⁷ See the schema Furlani, "Il libro", 193 and 3. However, this is the text version as L represents it, with its peculiarities, *ibid.* 13.

²⁸ Furlani, "Il libro", 189 f.

If we compare this with the lemma of B, we can see what has happened in the course of the manuscript tradition, at the latest in the joint original of I and C: "one of the practiced teachers" has become "the practiced teacher". Now a man was known who bore the epithet "teacher" (*malpana*) to distinguish him from others of the same name, namely the Nisibene teacher Michael; it is easy to understand that the anonymous collector was to be removed from his status in this way. Did the different naming in colophon B arise from the same need? Or has the name of the actual collector been preserved? Here the loss of the colophon in L is regrettably noticeable; perhaps a decision would have been possible with its help. The person who used the name Michael Malpana for the author could not have been aware of the name as it appears in B. This would argue against B preserving the actual collector. In any case, the attribution to [7] Michael Malpana prevailed, as can be seen from the Hss. in the Oriental libraries that Furlani lists, and whose possible dependence on one another (and their relationship to I and C) would probably reveal the path of the naming even more precisely.

The colophon of I (Syr. 99 partly in plain text, partly in app., Italian partly 131) reads:

End of the book of definitions made *by the great²⁹ teacher of the Church, Mar Michael Badoqa*. May our Lord let him rest in the (heavenly) abodes and be merciful to us sinners through his prayers. Amen.

The adjective "large" is reminiscent of the colophon of B, should this suggest a historical connection that should be distinguished from the question of the name?

The lemma of C (Syriac not listed separately, because almost identical to that of I, Italian. 12): "Scriviamo un discorso sopra la spiegazione delle definizioni di ogni modo e cosa assieme alle loro spiegazione e la divisione delle cose stesse, fatto *da Mons. Michele l'interprete e celebre dottore*." I assume that here, too, the adjective "celebre" stands for Syrian *mhira*.

The colophon of C (Syr. 99 partly in plain text, partly in app., Italian. 12):

End of the book of definitions made *by the teacher³⁰ Mar Michael*. And to God the glory and to the scribe Hormizd of Seert³¹. Forgiveness of guilt in judgment. Amen.

²⁹ Compare "great father" in the colophon of B. - C does not have *raba de 'edta*, s. 99 App.

³⁰ For a small difference to I, see the previous note.

³¹ On the scribe Hormizd, see also the colophon of the whole manuscript above.

If one compares this colophon with that of I, one has the impression that in I there is a multiplication of the predicates of Michael, and not, as Furlani assumes (99 app. to line 5), an omission on the side of C.

L occupies a special position among the Hss. because it offers the text in a form that distinguishes it strongly from B, C and I. Furlani (13) describes the form of the text as follows: "The definitions are not numbered. Characteristic of this edition of the text is the omission of all proper names and those sentences in which they occur. The three Arabic glosses of definitions 75, 76 and 95 are also missing. In some places the text is shorter; almost every line shows deviations in relation to codices B, C and I, which have a uniform text. The readings of this codex are not good." One must therefore distinguish between two texts, on the one hand the good text of B, C and I and on the other the shorter, poor text of L. Furlani is of the opinion that the original text of the collection is found on the page of B, C and I (i.e. he probably regards L as an *abridgement* of the original text, which is also poorly transmitted). Nevertheless, it is L's text that was inserted by "Bar Sarošway into his lexicon, and Bar Sarošway was plundered by Bar Bahlul. Thus, L's text can be found almost in its entirety in the edition of Bar Bahlul's lexicon, which Duval "provided" (1901). On the same page (13) Furlani draws a stemma of the Hss. he discusses, all of which he traces back in various ways, directly or indirectly, to an archetype; for him, L belongs to the indirectly derived ones.

Towards the end of his work (193), Furlani presents a huge and complicated family tree of the material included in the "Book of Definitions". According to what I have explained above, the author's name "Michael" must be deleted for the "book" in favor of an "Anonymus"; and according to what Furlani himself says about the collection of definitions, as it has been handed down to L and as it lives on in the two lexicographers, its producer, also probably anonymous, would have to be included as a separate figure.

To the right and left of "Michael, Buch der Definitionen" in the aforementioned family tree we find two further titles under the same author's name: "Der Mensch als Mikrokosmos" and "Quästionen". "Der Mensch als Mikrokosmos" is found in the same Hs. I, which is one of the witnesses to the "Book of Definitions", on leaves 421a1- 426a2. However, while the collection of definitions in Furlani's analysis of the manuscript is no. 26, "Der Mensch als Mikrokosmos" only appears as no. 7732. Furlani (192) states that in his introduction the author refers to the text as the last book of his "Quästionen" ³³. In Furlani's opinion, these could only be quaestions against the heretics, because under the name of Michael

³² Furlani, "Il manoscritto siriano 9": For no. 77 pp. 320, for no. 26 pp. 317.

³³ Without an autopsy of the manuscript, I cannot tell whether the explanatory sentence, "cioè l'ultima delle Ques- tioni sulle eresie o della taš'itha delle eresie", is Furlani's own equation or that of the Syriac author. What then follows about the intention of this last quaestion ("e quest'ultima se propone ...") naturally r e f e r s to the introduction of the text.

a work against the heretics in a manuscript by Seert; the quaestiones on the Scriptures mentioned in Ebed-Jesu, on the other hand, are out of the question. However, if Furlani (193) now assumes that the quaestio on "man [9] as a microcosm" was dependent on Aḥudemmeḥ and Theodor bar Koni (like the "Book of Definitions"), then the Nisibene teacher Michael would not be a possible author here either. In order to help decide this question, the Quaestio would have to be published and examined. First of all, I am against an a priori negative judgment in this case, above all because of the text still to be discussed.

We encounter Michael's quests once again, in which Furlani (192): The "Book of the Bee" by Solomon of Bosra (13th century) quotes in the 57th chapter (one of several about the eschatological events) at the end³⁴:

Michael the expositor³⁵ and exegete³⁶, however, says otherwise³⁷ in the *book of Questions*, speaking as follows: 'The world will not pass away and be dissolved before the vivification of the dead, but the coming of our Lord will be seen first of all, who will come with the spiritual hosts; and immediately our Lord's power will compel the earth to give up the parts of the bodies of men who have been slain and have become dust and ashes within it; and there will be a making ready and preparation of the souls to receive their bodies all together. If, before the vivification of the dead, the world and all that is therein were to pass away, from whence pray would the dead rise?³⁸ Those who say that the world will pass away before the vivification of the dead are fools and simpletons; for Christ will not make the world pass away before the vivification of the dead, but He will first raise the dead, and men will see with their eyes the passing away of the world, the uprooting of the elements, and the destruction of the heavens and the earth and the sun and the moon and the stars; and from here sorrow will begin to reign in the mind of the wicked, and endless joy in the mind of the righteous.'

Until proven otherwise, I see no reason to consider the Book of Quaestions of Michael Badoqa in Solomon of Bosra as anything other than the quaestions Michael speaks of in his Quaestio on "Man as Microcosm". To summarize, we can say that not only could the "Book of Definitions" not have come from the Nisibene teacher Michael Badoqa (which has always been assumed), but also that it was not compiled by any Michael around 900, who could possibly still be identified with his colleague Abzud. On the contrary, the "book" was originally anonymous; at one point, the author's name was tentatively mentioned.

³⁴ E. A. W. Budge (ed.), *The Book of the Bee*, Oxford 1886, syr. *qoph-nun-dalat* to *qoph-nun-he*. English translation 135. I include the quotation here for the greater convenience of the reader.

³⁵ *Mpašqana*.

³⁶ *Badoqa*.

³⁷ "Different" from the previously mentioned opinions, the last of which was that of the "interpreter", i.e. Theodor von Mopsuestia, as Budge correctly suspects.

³⁸ Note this sharply logical element in the author's argumentation and compare it with the "dispute" in the "Nestorian Collection" (n. 4 above), which is notable for the extreme brevity of its syllogisms.

B), but otherwise adopted the name of Michael Malpana or / and Badoqa in the manner described above.

Furlani has identified the "Writing on Dreams" as part of the "Book of Definitions", where it forms a long definition; it should therefore be deleted from the list of independent works by the real or fake Michael.

In contrast, the "Disputation" in the "Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts" and the excerpt from the "Quaestions" in the "Book of the Bee", whose author is Michael Malpana / Mpašqana / Badoqa, cannot be challenged as to their authenticity. The quaestio on "Man as Microcosm", which according to its author was the last in the Book of Quaestions, would have to be edited and examined for its authenticity.

3.3 Narsai, Ephrem and Cyril on Jesus' cry of abandonment Matthew 27:46

1 Narsai

The metrical homily of Narsai "On the Salvation¹ of our Lord in the Body and on the Suffering of Death² and the Cross" has been available for several years in the critical edition by Frederick G. McLeod³. In the description and interpretation of the crucifixion (lines 479-581), three of the words of the dying Jesus are used, all of them not as exact quotations: the promise of paradise to the robber (cf. Lc. 23:43), the placing⁴ of the "soul" into the hands of God (cf. Lc. 23:46, where the "spirit" is delivered into the hands of the Father) and the cry of abandonment (cf. Mt. 27:46). The explanations of the last two words are so interlinked that they must be quoted and discussed in context⁵.

Lines 512-581:

514/5	In the suffering of death suffered / the body, the garment ⁶ of the native,
[44] 516/7	and he ⁷ did not leave him, nor did he depart from him in a moment of humiliation.
518/9	To him ⁸ he entrusted his soul, / the mortal, mourning:
520/1	"Into your hands I place my soul ⁹ , / bring it to its dwelling place in peace".

¹ Here is the usual Syriac word for Greek *oikonomia*; the editor McLeod (see the next note) translates it as "manner of acting", which corresponds exactly to the Syriac root, see also his note on the passage (p. 107 n. 1).

² Death and the cross in that order.

³ *Narsai's Metrical Homilies on the Nativity, Epiphany, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension. Critical Edition of Syriac text, English translation* by Frederick G. McLeod (PO 41,1 = No. 182) 1979. In Mingana's list of extant Narsai homilies, the Passion homily is No. XXXVI; Mingana did not include it in his partial edition of 1906 (presumably for theological reasons). On Mingana's list and edition, see McLeod p. 8 n. 6. It would be desirable for all editors to give the Mingana numbers of both the list and the possible edition to the text in their editions, not only in the introduction (as McLeod, for example, does).

⁴ On the various Syriac verbs used for Greek *paratithemai*, see the essay by Tj. Baarda, p. 296, cited below.

⁵ McLeod, who organizes the entire text by subheadings, places the heading "Narsai's rejection of his Adversaries' Position" between 525 and 526.

⁶ On the "garment" see Sebastian Brock, *Clothing metaphors as a means of theological expression in Syriac tradition*, in: Margot Schmidt (ed.), *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihre Parallelen im Mittelalter*, Regensburg 1982, p. 11-38. Now [44] also in: Sebastian Brock, *Studies in Syriac Christianity* (Coll. Stud. Series 357), Aldershot 1992.

⁷ Sc. the native.

⁸ Sc. the native.

⁹ Cf. Lc. 23,46.

522/3 He bowed his head on the cross / and surrendered his soul to the Creator,
 524/5 in that the departure of his soul testifies / that his humiliation¹⁰ is not a
 was out of necessity.
 526/7 See the moment that shows / whose suffering and death these are,
 528/9 in that the Son of our race teaches us / that the Logos has no part in
 his suffering.
 530/1 "Into your hands I commend my soul" / - let us ask whose soul is this?
 532/3 That of the only begotten Son from the Father / or that of our Comrade, a
 son of Adam?
 534/5 The deity has no soul!¹¹ / Heretics, do not go astray!
 536/7 Not in the soul exists¹² / the life of the deity.
 538/9 It is the soul of the mortal / whose limbs he has put on,
 540/1 and when suffering touched his limbs, / it left him in the (utmost) distress
 nis.
 542/3 Whose soul was in the body / which the Logos chose as his dwelling place?
 544/5 She testifies by her departure / that she has left him at the moment of
 Death.
 546/7 It was the suffering one who suffered / in the hard suffering of the cross,
 548/9 as he cried out with a groan, "My God, my God, do not leave me "¹³.
 [45] 550/1 Not the Logos pleaded / to his Father, who is one with him.
 552/3 God does not have one God¹⁴, / Eutyches¹⁵! Why are you arguing?
 554/5 Not the Logos bowed his head / and surrendered his soul on the cross;
 556/7 the source of life does not die! / Hold back your reviling, outrageous
 ter!
 558/9 Nails and a spear were not hammered into his side¹⁶!
 560/1 The native has no limbs, / do not be impudent, heretic!
 562/3 He of flesh¹⁷ is the one whose body / was fastened to the wood of the cross;
 564/5 and he made supplication / because he was in need of help.
 566/7 It is the corporeal who tasted death, / because he was mortal in his nature

10 One Hs. reads "his death", see McLeod p. 124 n. 161.

11 This very bold-sounding statement is made clear by the next double line.

12 McLeod translates the participle with a perfect: "There has not subsisted in a soul: the vitality of the Divinity".

13 [45]Cf. Mt. 27:46 - McLeod translates the aphelion of *rp'* as "make weak": "do not let me grow weak". Although the causative of the root stem "soft", "lazy" can have this literal meaning, the evidence for the meaning "leave" seems to be more numerous.

14 This is an old anti-Aryan argument.

15 The mention of Eutyches is occasionally used to date this homily early, but even the Antichalcedonian Timotheus Aelurus († 477) still has to deal with Eutychians, so that the mention of the name does not provide a terminus ad quem. Philoxenus also makes a point of distinguishing himself from Eutyches.

16 I prefer this translation of 'yty', perhaps "Eternal" would be more appropriate in context. McLeod has "Self-Existent" (certainly because "being" has far too broad a meaning in English), but that sounds too much like hypostasis.

17 In Syriac, the adjective derived from "meat", which is too inappropriate in literal translation, regardless of whether you say "fleshy" or "carnal".

- 568/9 and begged the native / to give him back his soul at once
may.
- 570/1 He¹⁸ bowed his head at the gallows / and surrendered his soul to the Creator;
- 572/3 and when his soul departed to Eden, / his body remained in the grave.
- 574/5 The Logos of the Father did not leave / the pure dwelling¹⁹ that he chose for
himself
had;
- 576/7 and although he was in him from the beginning, / he did not suffer humiliation.
- [46] 578/9 He never went away from her, / not in suffering and not on the cross;
- 580/1 and he never suffered in his nature / in the sufferings that the corporeal endured.

The "quotations" from Lc 23,46 and Mt 27,46 are, as already mentioned, not such quotations, nor are they textual variants, but represent interpretations by the author. The changes to the wording are much greater in the second case than in the first. By replacing "spirit" with "soul" in Lc. 23,46, Narsai saves himself the trouble of explaining how "spirit" is to be understood in this passage, for example by saying that it cannot be the Trinitarian person of the Holy Spirit. He quite correctly regards "spirit" as a human life principle and uses "soul" instead; the soul as the life principle of the human body on the one hand and the Godhead as the life of itself on the other: 536/7. 540/1. 544/5. 556/7. 568/9. 572/3.

Theologically, the surrender of the soul by the crucified is evaluated in several ways. The most obvious aspect is the voluntary nature of Jesus' death (525: "not out of necessity"), but the proof of this is of course not, as it might seem from Narsai's formulation, that the soul departed, but that by speaking in the first person Jesus appears as the agent: in death his soul is not taken from him, but *he gives* up his soul and dies because of it.

Secondly, and this brings us to Christology in the narrower sense, death is proof that a real, bodily, human death took place here: the soul is given up, the body dies, the head of the crucified one sinks down (522/3. 570/1). The frontal position in which Narses argues, however, also requires the negative expression of the same fact: *not* the Logos bowed his head and delivered up his soul on the cross (554/5).

Thirdly, the main emphasis of this whole section of the Passion Homily lies on the polemical deposition, which it is not necessary to demonstrate in detail; I refer to McLeod's subheading. It is explained in detail whose soul is *not involved*: it is not the soul of the Logos or the Godhead.

It is astonishing how Narsai determines the recipient of the soul: it is the Only-begotten (518/9 in connection with the preceding double verses). Although it can also be said (523 and 571) that the [47] dying person hands over the soul to the Creator, in 568/9 it is again the Only-begotten who is to return the soul (to the body)

¹⁸ Sc. the corporeal.

¹⁹ Sc. the body.

(about this passage below). It is certainly not wrong to see the Logos in the Creator. In Luke, as we know, the dedication is preceded by the salutation "It is strange that this fact is not taken into account by Narsai, indeed that this form of address is not quoted at all. Does this have anything to do with Ephrem and the Dia- tessaron?"

2 Ephräm and Narsai

In the Armenian translation of the Ephremian commentary on the Diatessaron, the form of address "Father" ²⁰ is also missing; the dedicatory word is at the beginning of

c. XXI,1 in Leloir's outline ²¹. The explanation then begins, of course, with the hasty sentence: *Divinitas eius humanitatem suam commendavit* ²², which does not correspond at all with the biblical text. Fortunately, we have a fragment of the Syriac text for about two thirds of XXI,1, edited and thoroughly examined by Tj. Baarda (1961/2) ²³. The fragment is an excerpt from Ephrem's commentary within a Nestorian Hs. and thus does not belong to the leaves of Hs. Chester Beatty 709, which were published by Leloir in two groups in 1963 and 1990 ²⁴. Chester Beatty 709 contained the [48] entire commentary, but it cannot yet be fully reconstructed from the leaves found so far.

²⁰ The two later forms of the diatessaron I consulted offer the salutation "father" (see below n. 36).

²¹ Louis Leloir (ed.), *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'évangile concordant. Version arménienne*. (CSCO 137 = Arm. 1 textus, 145 = 2 versio) 1953. 1954. Not knowing Armenian, I quote only the translation volume, as CSCO 145, to make it easier to distinguish between Leloir's various editions with the same title. Cap. XXI, I: p. 222.

²² CSCO 145 p. 222.9 f.

²³ Tj. Baarda, *A Syriac fragment of Mar Ephraem's Commentary on the Diatessaron*, *New Testament Studies* 8 (1961/2) p. 287-300.

²⁴ Louis Leloir (ed.), *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant. Texte Syriaque (Manuscript Chester Beatty 709)*, (Chester Beatty Monographs 8), Dublin 1963. The same (ed.), *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant ... Folios additionnels* (Chester Beatty Monographs 8). In this second volume, Leloir aims to present a particularly clear Latin rendering of the Syriac and therefore reproduces prefigured and suffixed parts of sentences as being bound to their relational word by hyphens; the effect is rather irritating. In the following I distinguish between these two volumes as Chest. Beatty 709 I and II. As an appendix, Leloir prints an essay in Chest. Beatty 709 II, Leloir prints an essay in which a single leaf of the same manuscript is published: Pedro Ortiz Valdivieso, *Un nuevo fragmento siriaco del Comentario de [48] san Efrén al Diatésaron (P Palau Rib. 2)*. *Studia Papyrologica* 5 (1966) p. 7-17. Unfortunately, Leloir did not also reprint Baarda's publication (out of codicological purism?); he refers to it in Chest. Beatty 709 II p. VII n. 6. The English translation by Carmel McCarthy, *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron* (*Journ. Sem. Stud. Suppl.* 2), Oxford 1993, inserts the surviving Syriac original components into one another, supplements the gaps with the Armenian, but - so strong is Leloir's suggestion - brings the Baardas fragment in a note to c. XXI, 1 (p. 316 n. 1).

so that one has to rely on the Armenian translation for what is missing. The excerpt in Baarda has no counterpart in the published Chester Beatty sheets.

Like the Armenian translation, the fragment begins with the word of the cross *without* the address to the Father²⁵. Baarda has printed the Syriac text and follows it with English translations of the Syriac *and* Armenian in parallel printing²⁶. The Syriac original already shows that the Armenian translation of the first explanatory sentence is not correct. But Baarda's English translation is not correct: "327 his manhood commended his 4 godhead, for it left it [i.e. his godhead], 5 and let it suffer". "His godhead" of line 3/4 is a Syriac noun with prefigured *lamad*. Baarda's translation understands the *lamad* as an accusative sign. Apparently the Armenian translator was of the same opinion, considered the result of the translation to be theologically intolerable and therefore reversed the relationship between nominative and accusative. But "his godhead" with *lamad* is a *dative*: "his manhood commended to his deity", "his manhood commended to his godhead". Neither the Armenian translator nor Baarda have [49] seen that the object of the commendation or commendation is to be added tacitly from the immediately preceding biblical sentence: it is "commended" he, namely the Spirit of Jesus. So one must translate: "his manhood commended (it) to his godhead". In the rest of line 4, the position of the supplementary parenthesis should be changed. As it now stands with Baarda, one reads from it that the human nature leaves the divine, but already line 5, "and let it suffer", makes this view impossible. It should correctly be written: "for it [i.e. his godhead] left it (sc. the manhood) and let it suffer". Baarda's correction to the Syriac text of line 8 must be followed, where the "but" is changed to "not" (deletion of an *alaph*; the Armenian translation still reads correctly). In line 10, I cannot agree with the translation of "force" with prefigured *beth* by "by [a] force": the divine nature cannot be hidden "by a force" during the death of Christ;

25 The same version of the text, i.e. without the form of address "father" and with the same Syriac verb (participle *mg'l* instead of *s'm*) is quoted and *s'm* is rejected as inapplicable in a Ps. Nestorius text,

L. Abramowski - A. E. Goodman (eds.), *A Nestorian collection of christological texts*. Cambridge 1972, vol. I p. 205, (20) 21 f., vol II p. 123, (2) 3-5. Cf. already Abramowski-Goodman, NTS 13 (1967) p. 290 f. Neither Baarda nor the two mentioned deal with the fact of the missing salutation. - The quotation from this Ps. Nestorius would of course be particularly valuable if it came directly from the Diatessaron and not only from Ephrem's commentary. Unfortunately, I see no way of deciding this question.

26 Baarda p. 289 f. McCarthy (p. 316 n. 1) gives his own translation in more fluent English, which, however, does not change the problems I have discussed; Baarda's correction of "aber" to "nicht" (see below) is of course adopted by McCarthy.

27 To make it easier to discuss the text, I am counting through the lines of Baarda's translation (the lemma is not included). The brevity of the lines is explained by the parallel printing of the two English translations.

The Armenian "in His force" is more accurate. Line 22 "perceive" for Syriac *rgš*²⁸ would perhaps be even better "feel". The parenthesis "something" line 24 is superfluous because the content of the "shown" is communicated in lines 27 f. and 30-34.

With these few changes, Baarda's translation takes the following form:

Mar Ehpraem, the Teacher, from the Commentary of the Diatessaron Gospel:

1 *Into thy hands* - quoth he - 2 *I commend my spirit*; 3 his manhood commended (it) to his 4 godhead, for it (i. e. his godhead) left it, 5 and let [50] it suffer. 6 In this way, then, He was 7 separated from him, 8 not so that He tore 9 Himself away from him, but 10 while being hidden in (His) force 11 from the slain one 12 and the slayers. 13 For if He had appeared, 14 not even he that had been 15 slain would have feared; 16 and if He had been revealed, 17 not even the slayers 18 would have been able to slay. 19 But He surely guarded him, 20 lest he perished - while the 21 Guardian knew and he that 22 was guarded did not feel. 23 And then, at last, He was re-24 vealed, and He shewed 25 to both of them, 26 not only to the slain one 27 - that he was not left 28 alone in Sheol -, 29 but also to the slayers 30 - that they were not able 31 to perform their work: 32 and to guard the grave, 33 and to keep the corpse 34 in custody -.

Baarda has rightly perceived a grammatical difficulty, which is also one of content, in view of this text, namely the transition from "his humanity and his divinity", two feminine abstracts (lines 3-5), to the masculine pro-nouns of the following lines: "he³⁰ was separated from *him* etc."; after this it is evident that subject and object are no longer humanity and divinity³¹. In an annotation, Baarda makes the following consideration³²: "The sudden transition from feminine to

²⁸ *rgš* can mean both "to feel" and "to understand" (McCarthy has the equally possible "per-ceive"). Therefore, the Armenian translation has chosen "nesciente" as the literal opposite of "sciente" (correspondingly also Baarda, who translates directly from Armenian into English), without one therefore having to assume that the Armenian translator has read something other than *rgš*. ²⁹ Here Baarda inserts "[her]" in order to make the difference between the reading of the passage and other Syriac NT versions clear in the translation through this rendering of the object anticipated as a suffix, see Baarda p. 296 point (2). - Incidentally, Leloir says to Chester Beatty 709 I p. 210/211 in n. 3 to § 5 that the "use of the feminine verb form in *rwḥ*' (here and elsewhere, *infra*)" is "contrary to Ephrem's habits and casts doubt on the authenticity of the passage, indeed even of this whole last fragment." Does Leloir mean the coherent text of the leaves up to almost the end of the book? Baarda's fragment would fall under the same verdict according to these criteria. I have looked in Chest. Beatty I for passages with "spirit" and an associated verb and found (no claim to completeness!) in c. XXII,3 (i.e. Leloir's *infra*) p. 234/235 "Geist" with femin. verb. finitum. Leloir does not seem to have noticed, however, that the same is to be observed in much earlier passages of the volume, as in c. I,10 [50] (in the very first sentence) p. 8/9 fem. verb. fin., c. I,25 in the quotation Lc. 1,35 fem. verb. fin., c. X,15 p. 50/51 line 2 fem. part. act. In Chest. Beatty 709 II it is no different. This means that the whole Diatessaron commentary would have to be attributed to Ephrem! But isn't the explanation for this grammatical phenomenon to be found in the fact that Ephrem follows the commented biblical text?

³⁰ Also masculine in Syriac; this excludes the possibility that it is the spirit.

³¹ Baarda p. 298 point (f).

³² Baarda p. 298 n. 4.

masculine may be significant for the theology of Mar Ephraem. He does not mention the new subject and object explicitly, but there is reason to think of Father and Son. This would mean that he is identifying Father and godhead, Son and manhood. Therefore it could get a place in the Nestorian dogmatic catena in our manuscript". This attempted explanation (which, as far as the Nestorian is concerned, is wrong in terms of content) is rendered superfluous by a glance at the continuation of Ephrem's commentary in the Armenian translation:³³ "Et (Deus)³⁴ confirmavit [51] factis promissionem suam mortalibus; ostendit (enim) et perficiendo manifestavit, *humanitatem* suam posse pati, quia ecce mortua est; ostendit etiam eos, qui moriuntur, posse (rursus) vivere. Et resuscitavit eam (sc. *humanitatem*) ...". Ephremae thus switches freely between concrete and abstract terms, without any shift in content.

For our comparison with Narses it is important that Ephremae takes the dedication of Lc 23,46 as an opportunity to interpret the abandonment of Jesus in his death on the cross, i.e. to explain Mt 27,46. Yet Ephrem had already quoted Mt. 27:46 in c. XX,30 and, unlike Narses, quoted it literally³⁵. The interpretation in XX,30, however, does not make the abandonment of the crucified one the subject at all, but rather presents the dying one as victor. In this passage, Ephrem also allows the call to be addressed to the Father (which is not the case with Narses). This passage also contains an account of the misunderstanding of "Eli/Elijah". Furthermore, Ephraem speaks of the "first" and "second call" and their effect; the first call is of course the quoted word of Jesus, the second, according to the Matthean text, must be the "loud voice" with which Jesus

"cried out" by "giving up his spirit" (Mt 27:50). One could now assume that the Diatessaron referred to Lc 23:46 at this point ("I give up my spirit ..."). In Ephrem's commentary on the Diatessaron, such a combination is in any case assumed in the passage XXI,1 quoted above, and Narses also works with it. I have looked up two of the diatessaron forms available to us today; they do not place the two sentences directly next to each other³⁶.

33 CSCO 145, p. 222, 19 ff.

34 Leloir CSCO 145 p. 222,19 adds the more neutral "(Dominus)" instead of "(Deus)". But see the beginning of the next, second paragraph, p. 222,27-29: Natus est Deus naturae humanae unitus, non nativitate personae suae, sed nativitate naturae sibi coniunctae, cui naturale erat nasci secundum carnem. - One would give much credit to the Syriac original of this passage, but unfortunately the Syriac text has only been recovered from c. XXI,4 middle.

35 CSCO 145 p. 216,18; the interpretation referred to below extends to 217,10.

36 On the Diatessaron, see e.g. K. Th. Schäfer, Art. "Diatessaron", ^{LThK2}, vol. 3 (1959) and Dietrich Wünsch, Art. "Evangelienharmonie", TRE, vol. 10 (1982). The Arabic translation of the Syriac Diatessaron was produced in the 11th century by the Nestorian Abu'l-Farradj on the basis of a Syriac manuscript of the

The latter was strongly influenced by the Syriac Vulgate (Schäfer sp. 349 with Wünsche p. 628). I use the edition *Tatiani Evangeliorum harmoniae arabice*, ed. Augustinus Ciasca, Rome 1888, where the word abandonment is followed by seven biblical passages, among them the other words of the cross, and only then the word of dedication (p. 92 of Ciasca's Latin translation). - Similarly

In Narsai, both words of the cross are addressed from the human nature of Christ to the divine nature; the sufferer speaks to the Logos dwelling in [52] him³⁷. This is not presented so clearly in Ephrem, but even in him the abandonment does not concern Jesus and the Father, and the Spirit is not handed over to the Father, but to the divinity of Christ³⁸. This kind of exegesis must seem strange and artificial to us, it moves us away from the immediate impression that the evangelical account of the life makes on us; we find ourselves faced with a theological construction. One wonders about the theological motives for the introduction of these differences. The main reason must be the firm conviction of both authors of the fact that Christ is both man and God: this theological foundation cannot be ignored in the interpretation of the words of the cross. There is no doubt that Christ speaks in them as man - but is it Christologically conceivable that he speaks to the Father, to God, bypassing his divine nature, disregarding the fact that he is also God? Obviously not. In addition, for both theologians, for the Nicene Ephrem and for the Nicene Narsai, the homoousia of the

it is in the Liège Diatessaron. Edition: *Diatessaron Leodiense/Het Luikse Diatessaron*, ed. C. C. de Bruin, Leiden 1970, p. 266/268 of the original, p. 267/269 of the English translation.

37 Compare the prayer of thanksgiving handed down in two versions by Ps. Narsai and Cyrus of Edessa, which Theodore of Mopsuestia has Jesus address to the Logos at the last supper - to the Logos who has accepted him. On Ps. Narsai s. L. Abramowski in *Bulletin of John Ryland's Library* 78 (1996)

p. 87-100 [in this volume pp. 153-165], but already earlier on Cyrus of Edessa and Ps. Narsai F. W. Ma-comber in CSCO 355/356 (Syr. 155/156) 1974 and *Parole de l'Orient* 6/7 (1975/1976) p. 341-347.

38 G. Jouassard, *L'abandon du Christ en croix dans la tradition grecque des ^{IV}^e et ^{VI}^e siècles*, RSR 5 (1925) p. 609-633, points (p. 616 f.) to the "truly strange" exegesis of the call to abandonment by Epiphanius in the Panarion: "Pour lui, cette interrogation est le fait de la nature humaine de Jésus s'adressant à sa propre nature divine. Non pas que l'une soit alors séparée de l'autre". Epiphanius presents it in his chapter on the Arians (Heresy 69), § 63,1-68,6, GCS Epiphanius III (ed. Holl) 1933, p. 211,33-216,31. In the now complete English translation of the Panarion: Frank Williams (transl.), *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Books II and III (Sects 47-80, De Fide)*, (Nag Hammadi and Manichaeon Studies 36), Leiden etc. 1994, p. 381 (below) - 386. Jouassard, who still quotes after Migne, translates the most important part into French and remarks (emphasis mine, as above): "À prendre à la lettre cet exposé, il faudrait dire que pour saint Épiphane la divinité n'est pas demeurée unie au corps de Notre Seigneur pendant le triduum mortis. Mais ce n'est pas là ce qui attire son attention; ce qu'il veut montrer avant tout contre ses adversaires, c'est qu'il au moment de la mort la divinité ne s'est pas séparée de l'âme de Jésus, qu'il n'y avait alors en lui qu'une seule personne, Dieu et homme tout à la fois, bien que parlant à la divinité comme on le fait à une autre personne. La pensée d'Épiphane est peut-être un peu compliquée, sa façon d'exprimer à certains égards incorrecte"; but on the whole one can see what he is after. It can be stated that "sur le point précis des sentiments de Jésus en croix", Epiphanius does not succumb to the temptation of an allegorical interpretation. - Like Ephrem and Narsai, Epiphanius thus interprets Mt 27:46 in a Christological way, but unlike the latter he does not allow the Logos to be connected with the body in death, but with the soul. Such a sharp distinction in the person of Christ is thus not only to be found in the circle of the school of Diodorus; the problem of the unity of the two natures, as it presents itself under the aspect of the separation of body and soul in death, is however solved by Epiphanius in a way that is opposite to the Antiochian one.

deity of Christ with that of the Father. The deity of the person addressed is therefore none other than that of the Father, even if it is not the same Trinitarian person. In Mt 27:46, moreover, the form of address is not "Father" but "God", which presumably played a role, even if it seems sophisticated to argue with this.

3 Abandonment and non-abandonment - Distinction and unity in Christ

a) Ephraem

Ephraem clearly speaks of the deity of Christ *leaving* his humanity and *causing* it to suffer (lines 3-5). This results in a separation between them ("he was separated from him", line 6 f.), which in turn is interpreted twice by Ephrem, once negatively, once "positively". The separation *does not* mean that the divine "tears itself away" (or "cuts itself off", line 8 f.) from the human in Christ, i.e. the unity is not dissolved. What does occur, however, is what is as terrible for the dying Jesus as if God had torn himself away from him: God in his power "hides" himself not only from the execution staff, but also from the dying man (lines 10-12), otherwise his fear cannot be explained (line 15), nor can the fact that he is actually killed. The loneliness of someone who has been mistreated and consigned to an agonizing death can hardly be expressed more movingly. Although it can be deduced from the resurrection that God has kept him in his care, the dying and deceased did not realize this, did not "feel" it (lines 19-22). The tremendous contrast between the "knowledge" of the "guardian" (line 20 f.) and the "not-feeling" of the "guarded" is set within the one person of Christ, who is nevertheless "not torn apart" against all appearances; only in the resurrection do divine knowledge and human feeling come together again.

In [54] the continuation of our text, which is only preserved in Armenian,³⁹ Ephrem explicitly states that he is concerned with demonstrating the reality of the suffering and death of human nature in Christ. In the following § 2, Ephraem deals with the human birth of God in the human nature associated with him in order to prove the real corporeality of Jesus, which is the prerequisite for the real suffering and death. And in § 3 he informs us that he presents this to refute docetic views of Christ's suffering and death. That is, it is the insistence on the real human suffering of Christ, a Christ who is also God, that leads to such a sharp distinction between the two aspects in Christ that the human nature in him speaks to his divinity and the divine nature for its part is no longer perceptible to human nature.

³⁹ S. o. n. 34.

b) Narsai

In the piece from the Passion Homily of Narses quoted at the beginning, suffering and non-suffering, dying and not dying are strictly and sharply divided between the "Son of our race" (line 528) and the Logos (529). This distinction pervades the entire text; no further quotations are needed. It is the sufferer who addresses the two words of the cross interpreted here to the non-sufferer.

But unlike Ephremae, the dividing line between leaving and being left does not correspond to this precise distinction between the two natures in Christ. Rather, the unity of the Christological subject is expressed precisely in the fact that the Logos *does not* abandon the "of our generation", even in the phase in which the soul departs from the body of Jesus in death. As far as the relation of the divine to the human is concerned, the abandonment is not interpreted as a concealment of the divine, as in Ephremae, but is shifted within the one Christological subject, namely into human nature: the abandonment is the abandonment of the body of Christ by his soul. As stated, the Logos does not leave the body: "And he (the Only-begotten) did not leave it and did not depart from it, / even in the moment of humiliation" (line 516/7); "The Logos of the Father / did not leave the pure dwelling (the body) that he had chosen" (574/5); "And although he was in it (the dwelling) from the beginning, he did not suffer humiliation" (576/7);

"He never departed from it (the dwelling place), / [55] not in suffering and not on the cross" (578/9). Closely connected with statements about the non-suffering of the Logos during the suffering of Christ, the lines about the Logos not leaving the body of Christ, whether animate or inanimate, living or dead, form the framework around the interpretation of the words of surrender and abandonment. And roughly in the middle of the text is the word of abandonment, which, as we can now see, has been necessarily rephrased. In contrast to the biblical text, this word does not lament the abandonment by God, but asks that this state may not occur - a request that has already been positively granted.

The statements of Narsai just referred to, determined as they are by the principle of the unity of the person of Christ, observe at the same time the other principle that the unity must exhibit the peculiarities of the divine and human natures: the Logos does not suffer even in his inseparability from man, even though man inseparable from the Logos is subject to human death: his soul is detached from his body in death. The human suffering and the human death of the crucified remain human and lose nothing of their horror: Humiliation (line 517), mourning (519), the suffering of the limbs, i.e. the physical pain (540), the (extreme) distress (541), the hard suffering of the cross (547), crying with groaning (548), the pleading of the helpless (550. 564/5. 568), the hammered nails, the thrust of the spear into the side (558/9, cf. also 562/3).

The tension caused by the contrast between the two natures in the one Christ is extraordinary. Only the resurrection resolves it (644/5): "But the word that is in him

dwells" (namely "in the outer temple of his body", 642), "built" (after the destruction of the body through death, 643) "a building that will never be shaken again".

Since the Logos does not leave that which is mortal in man, the body, the only actual leaving that remains is the leaving of the body by the soul:

"the departure of his soul" (524), when "it (the soul) left him in (extreme) distress" (541), "its (the soul's) departure" (544), it left him "in the sight of death" (545), "when his soul departed to Eden" (572, cf. 521: "bring it to its dwelling place in peace").

After all this, one gets the impression that line 568/9, where the corporeal "begged the native, / that he might immediately return the soul to him [56]", is not meant to paraphrase the word of surrender, but the already rephrased call of abandonment.

4 Cyril of Alexandria

The depth of the theological concern with the two words of the cross that we find in Ephrem and Narsai can easily be seen in a counter-example, that of Cyril⁴⁰. He dealt with the word abandonment in several places: in the Thesaurus (between 423 and 425?)⁴¹, in two fragments from the commentary on Matthew (date?)⁴², in *De recta fide ad Augustas* (430) and in the dialog *Quod unus sit Christus* (434-437?). It would make sense to group the texts according to their composition before or after the outbreak of the Nestorian controversy. However, even in the writing to the empresses, the Anti-Arian scopos is still decisive for the interpretation; it is only in the dialog QUX⁴³ that the Antiochian interpretation is sharply opposed.

a) Thesaurus de sancta et consubstantiali trinitate

The 24th book of the Thesaurus is dedicated to words of mourning or fear in the mouth of Christ; the Arians took such sayings as an opportunity to ascribe to Christ a deity subordinate to the Father. Thus the use of the verb

⁴⁰ Literature on the patristic exegesis of Mt 27:46 in Hermann Josef Sieben, *Exegesis Patrum. Saggio bibliografico sull'esegesi biblica dei Padri nella Chiesa* (Sussidi Patristici 2), Rome 1983, no. 987-991. ⁴¹ Reference to the passage in Jacques Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle nestorienne*. Lille 1951, p. 119.

⁴² The first of these and the passage from *De recta fide ad Augustas* given in de Durand (see below n. 58) p. 445 n. 1.

⁴³ I take the convenient shortcut from de Durand.

This is justified in a separate section (PG 75, 397 D / 400 A). In his excellent book on Cyril's Christology before 428, Jaques Liébaert has only one short passage on this text. In it, he makes the reference to Athanasius (in this case to *Contra Arianos* III 56 and 57) that is characteristic of Cyril in this phase and remarks: "Christ *a dit* qu'il était abandonné; qu'à cette parole ait correspondu un sentiment réel, Cyrille, semble-t-il, ne le [57] pense pas; aucun indice positif ne le suggère"⁴⁴. This accurate judgment will be confirmed below, and another observation will be added.

It is useful to place the two immediately preceding sections from the thesaurus (397 B and C) next to this section.

1) 397 B: If the saints, in whose inner man Jesus Christ dwelt, did not fear death, how can he have feared death who teaches others to despise death? If one admires the bravery of those who have the Logos, how can one consider the Logos weak and discouraged, seized by fear and terror?

2) 397 C: The Savior has destroyed death through his death. Just as he would not have destroyed death if he had not died, the same applies to all the sufferings of the flesh. If he (it?) had not been afraid, nature (sc. ours) would not have become free from fear (likewise for grief and excitement). All human experiences of Christ are to be understood in the same way, in Christ "you find the sufferings of the flesh set in motion", not as if he were dominated by them as we are, but (rather) they are destroyed by the power of the Logos dwelling in the flesh, nature is transformed for the better.

3) Finally 397 D / 400 A: "On 'My God, my God'": In the cross of Christ we glory and believe that through it we are saved, because the Logos of God became flesh for our sake, was crucified for us in order to destroy death in us. Again, he will raise us up with him and lead us from corruption to incorruption. *"Now it had to be proved through him also that at the moment of suffering he was really man and was not taken for a man (merely) on the basis of some imagination. And for this reason he said what was fitting for a human being: 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken me', and: 'May the cup pass from me'.* But by his works he showed *that he is God who became man for our sake and endured this on the cross for the salvation of us all.*" The works are the miraculous appearances accompanying the [58] crucifixion; they and other things prove the Incarnate One to be God. According to the mockery of the onlookers, the centurion's exclamation already interprets the events as divine.

⁴⁴ Liébaert p. 119. In n. 1 Liébaert refers to the treatment of this passage from the Thesaurus by Jouassard, where it is only considered in the function of Cyril's controversy with Nestorius, but it must be seen as directed against the Arian use of Mt. 27,46.

Section 1) argues against the Arians that the sufferings of Christ cannot be the sufferings of the Logos dwelling in the flesh; section 2) argues that the human sufferings and death of Christ are for soteriological reasons: they are to be the sufferings of the Logos dwelling in the flesh.

"nature" (namely human, i.e. ours) from them. Section 3) adds an antidoketic aspect to the predominantly soteriological motifs: even in suffering, the incarnate must really be human and not merely be taken for one, which is why he speaks words like Mt 27,46. But Cyril *does not* give an interpretation of abandonment as such here. He proceeds like Ephrem in the Diatessaron commentary XX,30, where the citation of the word abandonment is not followed by an interpretation - although, as we have seen, it is provided there in XXI,1 in connection with the word of dedication.

b) Two fragments from the commentary on Matthew

Only Severus of Antioch has handed down a longer excerpt from the 12th book of Matthew's commentary on Mt 27,46; it can be found in *Contra Grammaticum* III 1,645, I quote it in full⁴⁶ in Lebon's as always excellent translation, which I have checked against the Syriac; I mark two small deviations, and I also emphasize particularly important lines:

His autem similia⁴⁷ et in libro duodecimo enarrationis explanatoriae evangelii Matthaei scripsit sic Cyrillus:

Extensis autem tenebris usque ad horam nonam, *vocem humanam*⁴⁸ *emisit unigenitus*. Dixit enim: "Deus meus, Deus meus, utquid dereliquisti [59] me". *Nec quisquam* putabit, qui sensum habeat, *tanquam infirmatum vel egentem auxilio* eum talia dixisse, nam Deus est secundum naturam et ipse virtus Patris (esse) concipitur. Haec autem rursus propter nos secundum dispensationem dixit, *ut aliquid rursus eorum, quae pro humanitate universaeque natura per ipsum recte geruntur*, disceremus⁴⁹. Et quidam est hoc? *Ipsa siquidem hominis natura, quia non habebat fiduciam apud Deum omnium*, tum propter transgressionem originalem, tum quia "prona est ad malum

⁴⁵ *Severi Antiocheni liber contra impium Grammaticum III 1*, ed. Joseph Lebon (CSCO 93 = Syr. 45 textus; 94 = 46 versio) p. 80,7-81,22 text; p. 56,15-57,17 translation.

⁴⁶ Since the Severus volume was published in 1929, Jouassard was not yet familiar with this quotation; de Durand p. 445 n.

1 refers to the passage, but only quotes a tiny part of it. - I have copied the references to the biblical quotations from Lebon's notes into the text and bracketed the italicized additions.

⁴⁷ Shortly before, Severus quotes a little from *Quod unus sit Christus*. It comes to him in its context Cyril does not make a divisio vocum (distribution of the words of Christ between the two natures) in his interpretation of Mt 27,46.

⁴⁸ "Humanam" stands for *megalē(i)* of the Gospel account, so to speak.

⁴⁹ Cf. the sentence of Leo the Great from a Passion sermon (PL 64,372): *Vox ista, dilectissimi, non est querela, sed doctrina*, quoted in L. Mahieu, *L'abandon du Christ sur la croix*, *Mélanges de science religieuse* 2 (1945) p. 214. After a brief patristic overview, the essay as a whole (p. 207-242) traces the problem from the early Middle Ages to modern times.

ab adolescentia sua" (Gen. 8,21), ut scriptum est, *non clambat libere ad Deum "Ut quid dereli- quisti me"*. At quia perfecte irreprehensibilis et libera ab omni peccato apparuit in Christ, - nam

"peccatum non fecit" (1 Peter 2:22), - orat ut respiciat et adiutor iam in suis (necessitatibus) fiat Deus omnium. *Iam autem dicere "Deus meus, Deus meus", non modicae fiduciae est*, nam dedignatur esse Deus eorum, qui diligunt peccata; propterea enim ad Judaeos dicebat "Quia vos non estis populus meus, nec ergo sim Deus vester" (Hos. 1,9). *Scandalum minime accipiendum est, si accideret⁵⁰ dicat Unigenitus, quamvis natura Deus sit "Deus meus, Deus meus"*; exinde enim nullum detrimentum patitur, nihilque rursus de gloria sua detrahit, quando ut homo dicit ad Patrem, qui in caelis (est) "Deus meus, Deus meus", quia nos quoque patrem vocamus Deum, utpote qui ad filiationem vocati sumus, et quamvis inveniamur inter creaturas et conditionem servitutis naturaliter habeamus. Quemadmodum ergo filiatio per gratiam non educit nos ab eo quod natura servi simus et cum servis reponamur, ita neque detrudit vere et naturaliter filium ad hoc ut sit servus et creatura sicut nos, id quod oeconomiae cum carne convenit. Hinc, etsi *Deum vocat Patrem cum factus est sicut nos et in nostris propter nos ut homo*, nihilominus tamen est natura Deus, servans naturae suae propriam nobilitatem et absque mutatione maiestatem et absque laesione dignitatem, *etsi caro factus, dum pulchre concedit etiam formae servi id quod evidenter⁵¹ et irreprehensibiliter ipsi debetur*.

The excerpt that Josef Reuß is able to provide in his compilation of fragments of Matthew's explanation from Catechism (Cyril no. 312)⁵² seems like an abridged version of this interpretation. In this [60] collection, Cyril is the only one who contributes something to Mt 27:46. Of course, this does not necessarily mean that all the other expositors represented in the volume shied away from dealing with the difficult word; it is much more likely that Cyril's interpretation seemed most acceptable to the Catenists⁵³, albeit with a decisive softening: the caller is referred to as "the Lord" and not as "the Native" (or "Logos"), i.e. he is not given the title that is initially given to the pre-existent and thus to his divine nature, but that under which his human nature is also subsumed from the outset. This fragment reads:

The Lord said this word as a man, so that he might bring about for our, the human nature⁵⁴ that we (can) say to God with confidence (*parrhesia*): "Why have you forsaken me?"; only

⁵⁰ Lebon has "forte" for Syr. *gdš*, which can mean both "probable" and "accidental". But the latter meaning is present here, it is to be taken sensu stricto: "not concerning the (divine) nature as such".

⁵¹ Lebon "singulariter", like "evidenter" one of the possible translations of *ydy'yt* (Greek. *dēlon?*), but "evident" fits better.

⁵² Joseph Reuß (ed.), *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt* (TU 61), Berlin 1957, p. 265. The excerpt runs under the [60] double attribution Johannes (meaning Chrysostom) - Cyril. The justification for the attribution to Cyril can be seen from the comparison with the piece from QUX cited below.

⁵³ Among the authors of the volume is Theodore of Mopsuestia; as his interpretation of Mt. 27.46 could have looked like is shown (but only partially!) by a polemical statement by Ky- rill, which is quoted below.

⁵⁴ For this translation of the verb *katorthōō* s. Guido Müller, *Lexicon Athanasium*, s.v. 2.

For the pure and (those) without sin are able to say this fearlessly⁵⁵. By saying to the Father, "My God", the one who is God by nature suffers no harm with regard to his own deity and glory when he, as a human being, says this in a manner befitting his humanity; since we too, when we call God "Father", do not dismiss the fact that we are human by nature and creatures of God, even if God calls us to *s o n s h i p* by grace because of faith in Christ.

In this abridged version, the anti-Aryan accent is clearly evident, dominating two thirds of the text.

If we now look at the detailed excerpt in Severus, the interpretation of the cry of abandonment as an expression of confidence is, as in the abridged version, new and also strange. In the Thesaurus one could still have the impression that, according to Cyril's previous^[61] considerations, Mt 27:46 was to be counted among those words of Christ in which human fear was expressed.

Unlike in the Catena fragment, it is the Only Begotten who calls with a human voice; but since he is God by nature, we must not infer from this that the caller is in need of help. Rather, the call is made with a soteriological intention: Christ acts for the whole of human nature, we should learn something from his call. Because of its sinfulness, human nature as a whole has no confidence in God and could not call "freely" in this way. - (Does confidence and freedom refer to the "why" question, which implies a reproach that cannot be made against God?) - Only those who are free from sin can pray to God in this way - which Cyril explains as follows: Christ is free from sin. Even the cry "My God, my God" is a sign of no small trust (- a very beautiful thought, and in view of the whole psalm also true -). People who do not love God would not call out like this. The fact that the Only Begotten, God by nature, addresses his Father as "my God" cannot be considered an offense, for this exclamation does not affect the divine nature as such, but is incidental to it, so that no harm is added to it. Positively, turned towards human nature, it can be inferred from the exclamation that the Only Begotten became man like us for our sake and that he therefore concedes to the form of a servant what is due to it.

The anti-Arian tendency is also fundamental in this longer piece from the commentary on Matthew. As far as the insistence on the soteriological outcome of the death on the cross is concerned, there is certainly nothing to be said against it. Admittedly, we hear nothing of the state of the man hanging on the cross, of which the Gospel text speaks in a poignant way. Cyril's "optimistic" exegesis works against the

⁵⁵ The normal meaning of *adeēs* is "needless", but Liddell/Scott also knows the translation derived from another root, which I prefer here. "Unneedy" of help would be logos; human nature is of course dependent on help, but not in the case of the sinless

Jesus, who wants to share his "confidence" with us, namely in the help to be granted.

is downright inappropriate. It therefore does not appear to be a coincidence that he *does not* give us an explanation of abandonment in this context, i.e. that he does not deal with the real theological problem of quoting the Psalm in the mouth of the Crucified.

c) Ad Augustas de recta fide 17 (olim 18)⁵⁶

The section begins with the quotation from Mt 27:46, and the rhetorical question is immediately posed: "Are we therefore saying that the Logos from [62] God the Father himself needs help from above?" Such an assumption would be foolish⁵⁷ since he is co-ruler with the Father, involved in creation and Lord of hosts. Then follows (without any transition) a possible objection from the Passion story: "But he was weak against the attacks of the Jews, and the hand of the crucifiers was impregnable to him". Cyril counters this with Isa. 40:15.18, where the "nations" "are like a drop in a jug", i.e. like nothing - but comparisons with God are not appropriate at all (i.e. the distance cannot be measured)! This is followed by a retelling of John 18:3-6, how at the first attempt the thieves cannot seize Jesus, but rather fall to the ground at his "It is I". The idea of Christ's weakness must be rejected: "How weak was he who by one word alone proved the weakness of those who were lying in wait for him?" - As you can see, up to this point the "arguments" have been placed side by side without any connection. In a second attempt this becomes different, as can be observed in the following.

But what does the cry of abandonment (which is now quoted again) mean? At this point, Cyril feels compelled (for the first time in the sequence of our texts) to define the content of the verb "to leave"; various forms of the verb and the corresponding noun are used in the following lines. The explanation, as we shall see, is again salvation-historical-soteriological. The author starts with the forefather Adam: he violated the divine commandment and did not care about it, which is why "*the nature of man was in a sense (! pōs) abandoned by God*", cursed and held fast by death. After the arrival of the only-begotten Logos of God, who took on the seed of Abraham and became like the brothers, *the abandonment* that man's nature experienced in the beginning had to end along with the curse and corruption.

Just as he shares with us in flesh and blood, *so he says like one of the forsaken*,
 "Why have you forsaken me?". *This is what the one who ends our abandonment*
says,

like one who persuades the father for his own sake and whose benevolence

⁵⁶ ACO I 1.5 p. 34.18-35.8.

⁵⁷ Cyril and the Antiochians draw very different conclusions from this shared premise. the conclusions. Cyril: the Logos (qua man) calls, therefore the call is not a cry for help; the Antiochians: it is a cry for help, therefore it is not the Logos that calls, but man (or the Lord as man).

(*eumeneia*) as referring to himself *and* the first (man). Christ is the [63] originator of all good for us; if someone wanted to say that he, Christ, received something from the Father in a human way, then he turned it to our nature, since he is perfect and as God needs nothing at all.

Abandonment is thus reinterpreted as the state of the sinner's abandonment by God that has existed since the Fall (so to speak!), which cannot be expressed by Christ in the proper sense. The Incarnate One shows solidarity with the sinner, i.e. with human nature, on the cross and calls for help as if he were such a sinner. In doing so, he calls for help for us and at the same time grants it to us. The actual suffering, loneliness and fear of death of a cruelly executed man can no longer be felt in this interpretation - the offensiveness of the death on the cross has disappeared above the summation of the soteriological yield.

d) *Quod unus sit Christus*

In contrast to the presentation in the writing to the empresses just mentioned, in QUX Cyril engages in clear polemics against the Antiochene Christology in its application to Mt 27,46. In his introduction to the edition of QUX58, G. M. de Durand has shown that Cyril is not only combating Theodore of Mopsuestia here, but also Diodorus of Tarsus⁵⁹. De Durand quotes from Diodorus, *Fragm.* 18, in Brière's translation⁶⁰, whereby an error has crept into the rendering⁶¹; I will follow the same passage in German translation, but extended by a sentence characteristic of this excerpt, and proceed more literally than R. Abramowski⁶²: "For the (word): 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?' not only does not belong to the God Logos, but I also do not deny that it belongs to the body, as one who, because he has been forsaken, cries out. For why does he lament as one who has been [64] forsaken? Did he not immediately foresee his resurrection and his glory?"⁶³.

⁵⁸ Cyrille d'Alexandrie. *Deux dialogues christologiques*, ed. G. M. de Durand (SC 97), Paris 1964.

⁵⁹ De Durand p. 64 ff.

⁶⁰ M. Brière, *Fragments syriaques de Diodore de Tarse*, ROC 30 (1946) p. 266.

⁶¹ De Durand p. 65 f. In the 3rd line of the left column of p. 66 one must read for "a été créé": "il a crié".

⁶² Rudolf Abramowski, *Der theologische Nachlaß des Diodor von Tarsus*, ZNW 42 (1949) p. 37.

⁶³ The fragment ends after a few more lines with an analogous question (according to Brière; R. Abramowski reads the sentence as indicative). If Diodorus gave an answer to these questions in his text, i.e. if he did not merely pose the questions as rhetorical ones, such an answer has carefully *not* been excerpted. We are familiar with the excerptor's technique from his treatment of Theodore's texts in the same collection, because with Theodore, unlike with Diodore, we have the possibility of comparison through several tradents.

Cyril⁶⁴ objects to this understanding of the word of the cross (he does not even consider the problem identified by Diodorus in his question) and "marvels" at the Antiochians, who describe the sufferer as united with the native and as partaking of divine dignity⁶⁵ in order to then expose him to the horrors of death, so that he might correspond to us, namely be "naked" and stand there as one who has drawn no benefit from the divine dignities.

We recognize the Theodorean keywords of *synapheia*⁶⁶ and participation in the divine glory. And indeed, the Antiochians really do make Jesus suffer the horrors of death - which Cyril obviously considers wrong, because Jesus must have had something of his union with the divine nature. In its trivialization of the actual suffering of a man condemned to an agonizing death, this sequence from the divinity of the Christ figure seems downright cynical.

Shortly afterwards, Cyril gives "the meaning of the Savior's words" (in the call to abandonment). In a lengthy exposition, he again develops the ideas already familiar to us of the abandonment of God acquired through Adam (of a limiting "as it were" is no longer heard): "Since we have become accursed through the transgression of Adam ... *forsaken* of God." A second Adam [65] was necessary (this is an unfolding of the topos in relation to the previous scripture), who is beyond all sin, spotless, the beginning of the new generation, i.e. Christ, who changes human nature and calls down the divine *eumeneia* (see above) from the Father and ends the forsakenness through obedience (the "obedience" is again an extension of the motif group).

Cyril now quotes as already in Matthew's commentary: "For he committed no sin" (cf. 1 Pet. 2:22), in him our nature became "rich in blamelessness", so that he could finally cry out of confidence (*parrhesia*, see above the excerpt in Severus and the Catenene excerpt): Mt 27:46. Consider that the Incarnate One-born speaks such words, as one of us and for the whole nature, almost (*mono- nouchi*) as if he wanted to say - and now Cyril puts his interpretation of the cry of abandonment as speaking in the 1st person into the mouth of the dying man, it is the salvation-historical-soteriological explanation we already know.

If one realizes the concrete situation of the crucified while he calls out the word of forgiveness, then one sees how far Cyril is from the imagination of the actual crucified.

⁶⁴ For the following SC 97 p. 442 / 444/ 446/ 448.

⁶⁵ De Durand *inserts* p. 442,21 from the Syriac and Armenian *anthrōpon*, but this relief is superfluous, *koinōnon* as the subject of the Acl is completely sufficient.

⁶⁶ It is not superfluous to recall that *synapheia* (and the corresponding verb) is a terminus technicus for the Antiochians (and not only for them, compare *conjunctio* in Augustin), which has the meaning of *asynchytos henōsis*. Cyril, on the other hand, either deliberately misunderstanding or unfamiliar with this usage, only wants to see in it the usual meaning of, among other things, "friendly association" such as between teachers and pupils. When he expresses the opinion of Antiochians using this vocabulary, in his opinion this ipso facto implies a lack of orthodoxy.

This is a far cry from the actual process⁶⁷ ; compare this with Narsai's account above: "And he spoke with a groan".

The self-explanation begins again with the first man's transgression of the commandment and its consequences; the deceptions of the "dragon" are also mentioned here. "But you planted me as a second beginning", I am called the second Adam. In me you see the nature of man purified. "End the abandonment". I have defeated Satan, he has found nothing of his own in me. Cyril adds (I have already quoted this above): "Such then, I think, is the meaning of the Savior's words" ⁶⁸.

As the dialogue continues, the Antiochian view is once again considered with disgust: "It is therefore nonsense and completely deviating from the sacred writings to think and say that the assumed man used human words as one who had been abandoned by the Logos [66] associated with him." ⁶⁹ Cyril probably has a text by Theodore in mind, although, strangely enough, an exactly corresponding text has not come down to us⁷⁰. But this much is clear, that in the passage meant the call of abandonment was addressed to the Logos. Since the *synapheia* of Logos and man in Christ is indissoluble for the Antiochians (which Cyril, of course, does not reveal), it can be assumed that, as in Narsai, the unity of Logos and body is to be presupposed for the period of rest in the tomb.

Incidentally, great caution must be exercised when projecting back from Narsai's very specific interpretation to the Antiochians of the previous generation(s) (this applies in particular to the reformulation of the call to abandonment). For Narsai is already reacting, as his evocation of Eutyches shows, to the more extreme followers of Cyril.

The always maintained anti-Arian approach of the Cyrillic interpretation of Mt 27,46 is expressed in the adherence to the axiom of *apatheia* for the divine nature of Christ - the axiom is just as valid for him as it is for the Antiochians. Only it has the effect of

⁶⁷ Cf. also Jouassard p. 630: "Transformer un gémissement en explosion de confiance et d'assurance, voilà certes qui est fait pour nous dérouter un peu et qui ne répond guère à la première impression produite en nous par le récit évangélique. But that is well the sentiment of Saint Cyril, qui dépasse ainsi le point de vue de ceux qui l'avaient devancé dans l'interprétation métaphorique de ce passage".

⁶⁸ SC 97 p. 444,17 f.

⁶⁹ SC 97 p. 446.31-34. - On "connected" see n. 66.

⁷⁰ What is quoted in the 4th session of the 5th Council 553 (probably from Theodore's commentary on the Psalms)

(ACO IV 1 p. 53,18-27), contains Mt. 27,46, but the quotation is cited because Theodore says: psalmus (sc. 21 LXX) nullatenus convenit domino, for Christ, who is without sin, could not have said: *longe a salute mea verba delictorum meorum* (verse 2b of the psalm; LXX assumes a different vocalization than the Masoretic text). When he was oppressed in the Passion, the Lord himself had said *secundum communem hominum legem* Mt 27:46. It is obviously the apostles who referred verse 19 to him, for what David first said *supra modum* (*kath'hyperochēn*?) of himself, because of the evil done to him, happened to Christ in reality.

The human nature of Christ is not the same: it outshines Christ's human nature to a certain extent (even if its sinlessness and perfection are given as justification). The non-suffering of the Godhead corresponds to the factual non-suffering of Christ's human nature - yet it is not denied death.

Whereas in Cyril the dying man on the cross does not feel any abandonment himself, but through his call shows solidarity with us in our sinful abandonment of God, in Ephrema the crucified man suffers the terrible loneliness of the tortured, in which he does not know that God (his divinity) has not torn himself away from him. In Narsai, finally, the suffering of the man hanging on the cross is seen realistically enough: the dying man "pleads with groans" because he [67] needs help. But the bitter realization of God's abandonment has become a plea that this abandonment may not come to pass; understood as a plea for the immediate return of the surrendered soul, it becomes a plea for the restoration of the unity of body and soul and thus for the abolition of the death that has occurred. For Narsai, therefore, the imminent resurrection has an effect on his understanding of abandonment⁷¹.

Les extrêmes se touchent: As with Cyril, we must note in the strict anti-Cyrrillian Narsai a softening of the call to abandonment to the point of reinterpretation. Not only do both share the axiom of apathy, as already mentioned, but in both cases their attempts to come to terms with the biblical text are based on the conviction of the indissoluble unity of the God-man Christ.

⁷¹ It is all the more regrettable that we do not have the continuation of Diodorus' fragment 18 (see above at and with n. 63), which might have revealed a prehistory of Narsai's exegesis.

3.4 "The stupor that interrupts prayer"

Euagrius, Cent. Suppl. 30, in translation,
original (?) and interpretation

With the first line of my heading I quote a title from Beulay's monograph on John of Dalyatha1: "La stupeur, qui interrompt la prière"; the title precedes pages 215-239 in Beulay's book. In terms of content, it is an abridged version of sentence 30 from the Supplementa to the Centuries of the Kephalaia gnostica, which we know in its Syriac translation from the so-called Short Commentary of Babai on the Centuries and the Supplementa2. This sentence reads in Syriac3:

[illegible]

Frankenberg, the editor of the commentary on the Centuries, gives the following Greek retroversion⁴:

Προσευχή ἐστὶ κατάστασις νοῦς μόνον ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος φωτὸς δι' ἐκστάσεως

...

One notices that Frankenberg has translated back the last word in the Sentence, the participle ጸሐፊው , left open. We will see that there are two possible explanations for this.

[16] Hausherr provides the first of these in an essay from 19325:

Frankenberg obviously found the word incomprehensible and shrank back from it, which is a credit to his clear-sightedness. For the whole difficulty was due to a simple reading error on the part of the Syriac translator, as can be seen from the Greek original of Sentence 30 that has just come to light, contained in Ms. Paris. Fonds grec 913 under the name of Nilus. There the sentence reads⁶:

Προσευχή ἐστὶ κατάστασις νοῦ ὑπὸ φωτὸς μόνου γινομένη τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος.

Hausherr gives no information about the finder or the place of publication, but it is Muyldermans' *Eugriana* of 1931, namely the note additionnelle⁷. For Hausherr, the theory of Isaac of Nineveh is based on the fact that there is no

1 R. Beulay, *L'enseignement spirituel de Jean de Dalyatha, mystique syro-orientale du VIII^e siècle*, Paris 1990.

2 W. Frankenberg (ed.), *Euagrius Ponticus* (AGWG. PH-NF 13,2) 1912, p. 8-471.

3 P. 454.

4 P. 455.

5 I. Hausherr, *Par delà l'oraison pure grâce à une coquille. A propos d'un texte d'Évagre*, Rev. d'ascétique et de mystique 13 (1932) p. 184-188. Photomechanically reprinted: I. Hausherr, *Hésychasme et prière* (OCA 176) 1966, p. 8-12. I quote here according to the 1932 page numbers because Beulay also does so; it makes it easier to follow cross-references.

6 Hausherr 1932 p. 187.

⁷ J. Muyldermans, *Euagriana*. Extrait de la revue *le Muséon*, t. XLIV, augmenté de Nouveaux fragments grecs inédits, Paris 1931. In the *Muséon*, the article had two parts, the first called "Euagriana"

Householder described. The question therefore arises once again as to which side of the tradition preserves the original meaning. Was "through ecstasy" added in the Syriac or was it deleted in the Greek? In the latter case, this would be a critical softening; we know the phenomenon as such for the entire corpus of the *Kephalaia gnostica*.

Sentence 30 has been subjected to a purely mechanical-practical shortening in a further stage of transmission. The preceding sentence 29 also precedes it in Fonds grec 913¹⁴. Which means in Frankenberg's retroversion¹⁵:

προσευχή ἐστὶ κατάστασις νοῦς πάντων ἐν τῇ γῇ λογισμῶν φθαρτικῇ
appears in the fund grec 913 as¹⁶:

προσευχή ἐστὶ κατάστασις νοῦ, φθαρτικῇ παντὸς ἐπιγείου νοήματος.

The only difference here is to be seen in the numerus of "thought" (the fact that Frankenberg has not chosen the correct synonym is irrelevant), Frankenberg's "on earth" only indicates the usual difficulty of rendering a compound Greek word adequately in Syriac. Here we can assume that we actually have the Greek original of sentence 29 before us. In Cod. Barb. Gr. 515, sentences 29 and 30 have been combined as follows because of the same beginning¹⁷:

προσευχή ἐστὶ κατάστασις νοῦ, φθαρτικῇ παντὸς ἐπιγείου νοήματος ὑπὸ φωτὸς
μόνου γινομένη τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος.

[19] Within the *Supplementa* to the *Centuries* of Euagrius, clauses 29 and 30 are part of a small group of definitions of prayer in its various forms and contents (29-33). Statements about the state of the intellect can already be found in c. 2-4. However, none of these help to answer the question of whether ecstasy belongs in the original of sentence 30, and if so, how, i.e. with which verb, its effect on prayer was described as a state of the intellect. Incidentally, Hausherr declared in 1936¹⁸ that "Euagrius had dropped the theory of ecstasy"¹⁹; he does not mention suppl. 30 on this occasion, just as he does not mention

ⲕⲁⲛⲁ= ecstasy in his investigation of the original form of 30. With regard to ecstasy, you can get a little further if you read the scripture

"On Prayer" from PG 79, which is found there among the works of Nilus.

¹⁴ In order to avoid confusion, I have retained the numbering of the *Supplement Centuries* as given in Babai's commentary throughout; the (Ps.) Nilus collections edited by Muyldermans have different numbers. I give their numbers in the notes.

¹⁵ Frankenberg p. 453.

¹⁶ Muyldermans p. 41 (no. κς').

¹⁷ Muyldermans p. 17 (no. 17).

¹⁸ Hausherr, "Ignorance infinie", OCP 2 (1936) p. 351-362; reprinted in the anthology I. Hausherr, *Hésychasme et prière* (OCA 176) 1966, p. 38-49 (double pagination).

¹⁹ Ibid. p. 357-359. 359 below, 361 above.

but was assigned to Euagrius by Hausherr in 1934²⁰, and rightly so, as has since been generally recognized. For the sake of interest, I mention the end of c. 70, where the relationship between prayer and "thought" is defined as in our sentence 29 above: προσευχή γάρ ἐστὶν ἀπόθεσις νοημάτων, "prayer is the removal of thoughts".

The state of prayer can disappear, c. 47: If you fall into anger, he (the demon) "makes the best catastasis, practiced from praying, disappear (ἀφανίζει)." This is immediately obvious: a negative emotion of the soul makes it impossible to remain in the "best state". Our problem is, of course, whether the state of prayer also "disappears" through something even higher or the highest form of the state ceasing to be a "state of the intellect".

While Euagrius speaks of the catastasis of the intellect at the beginning of the Supplement-Centuries and later of prayer as a catastasis of the intellect, the statements of the Prayer Scripture mainly concern the catastasis of prayer [20] (on catastasis of the intellect c.3, see below). One could put this in relation to a further specification (namely in the Supplement), but I am not sure whether Euagrius can be systematized that far. It is probably also necessary to differentiate according to the intended recipients - the prayer-writing is written at the request of a confrere, whereas the Supplement-Centuries are of the genre of the preceding Gnostic Centuries. However, the sententious character is common to both texts.

We find the vocabulary of ecstasy and rapture in chapters 3 and 52 of the prayer scripture.

c. 321: "Prayer is conversation of the intellect with God; which catastasis does the intellect need to be at rest in order to be distracted²², to be placed outside itself towards its familiar master and to converse with him without any intermediary?"

²⁰ Rev. d'asc. et de myst. 15 (1934) p. 34-94. 113-170. Detailed information on the republications in Guillaumont's monograph on the Kephalaia gnostica: p. 342.

²¹ ἡ προσευχή ὁμιλία ἐστὶ νοῦ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

ποίας οὖν δεῖται κατάστασις ὁ νοῦς, ἵνα ἡσυχάσῃ ἀμεταστροφῶς ἐκσταθῇ πρὸς τὸν οἰκεῖον δεσπότην, καὶ συνομιλεῖν αὐτῷ μηδενὸς μεσιτεύοντος;

In Hausherr's Syriac translation of the first 35 chapters (corresponding to 32 chapters in Greek) of the Prayer Book (OCP 5, 1939, p. 11-16, within the essay *Le "De oratione" d'Évagre le Pontique en syriaque et en arabe*, p. 7-71), ἐκσταθῇ, which contains a series of

The Latin translation (PL 79) says "transeat", which is rendered with ܬܬܪܬܐ "to be stretched out" (p. 11).

²² Thus the Syriac translation most aptly for ἀμεταστροφῶς, whereas the Latin translation In PL, he writes the derived "immutabiliter" and feels obliged to add a "mutet": "sese immutabiliter mutet".

c.5223: "The catastasis of prayer is dispassionate behavior, by utmost love to the intelligible height rapturing the philosophical spiritual intellect²⁴".

[21] If I understand this correctly, then the state of prayer and the corresponding state of the intellect is the basis and prerequisite for the outward appearance and the Rapture. There is no reflection on whether or not the Rapture should be regarded as a separate stage within this state. Taking Supplement No. 30 into account, an ambivalence arises which can probably partially explain the apparent or seeming inconsistency in Isaac of Nineveh. We shall see that in his commentary Babai takes a decided view that corresponds to a conservative interpretation of the statements of the prayer scripture, even if he does not mention them. The version of sentence 30 edited by Muyldermans, which Hausherr considers to be the original, eliminates the problem by deleting the mention of ecstasy. It is therefore a lightening of the text. Since, as we see, Euagrius can speak of rapture during prayer, the rule of *lectio difficilior* is to be applied here and δι' ἐκστάσεως is to be regarded as belonging to Euagrius' original text.

So if we insert "through ecstasy" into the Greek form of sentence 30, we get:

προσευχή ἐστι κατάστασις νοῦ ὑπὸ φωτὸς μόνου γινομένη τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος δι' ἐκστάσεως.

At first glance, it is obvious that now γινομένη no longer fits into the statement, because of course prayer as a catastasis of the intellect does not first come about through ecstasy. The participle γινομένη in this form cannot therefore be the one written by Euagrius. On the other hand, the position of the participle in the middle of the sentence seems to me to be the original one and the change in Syriac an understandable syntactical simplification. I conclude this from the fact that things are the same in sentence 29: the verbally functioning adjective is placed in the middle of Muyldermans' text, the Syriac participle, which serves to render it, at the end of the sentence. Incidentally, "through ecstasy" was particularly easy to continue at the end of the Greek sentence.

I wonder whether the present γινομένη might not also be the residual product of a deletion. You need a verb that at least partially overlaps with the Syriac translation in its range of meaning. If you form a passive voice from ܡܕܝܢ in the sense of "to interrupt", the "to be interrupted", like

²³ κατάστασις ἐστὶ προσευχῆς ἕξις ἀπαθῆς ἔρωτι ἀκροτάτῳ εἰς ὕψος νοητὸν ἀρπάζουσα τὸν φιλόσοφον καὶ πνευματικὸν νοῦν.

A Syriac translation of c. 52 is not available, see above n. 21.

²⁴ Hausherr OCP 1936 (see above n. 18) p. 359 on this passage: Here Euagrius is not talking about actual ecstasy.

If we take the meaning "to cease", which is closer to our case, we would have to translate it rather awkwardly as "to be made to cease". This seems to me to be the best possible meaning, for is prayer that turns into ecstasy strictly speaking still a state of the intellect? Does the intellect then still have an awareness of itself? In view of the method of changing [the wording] of the preserved Greek version by mere deletion, I would like to suggest that the Greek γινομένη be preceded by ἀπογινομένη: ἀπογινομένη. Its medial form would explain the choice of a passive form in Syriac. The Greek verb is apparently not very common; it is not listed as a lemma in Lampe's PGL, but this only means that its meaning is assumed to be known. Among the synonyms offered by the lexicons, "ver- loren gehen, dahinschwinden" (Menge/Güthling), "to be taken away" (Liddell/Scott) are quite useful.

ܠܡܕܥܬܐ should be taken as an attempt to approximate the intended connotation of a difficult Greek verb for which there is probably no exact Syriac equivalent. We thus obtain the Greek original of sentence 30:

προσευχή ἐστὶ κατὰστασις νοῦ ὑπὸ φωτὸς μόνου ἀπογινομένη (?) τῆς ἀγίας τριάδος δι' ἐκστάσεως,

where the restituted participle unfortunately remains hypothetical.

The two sentences 29 and 30 of the Supplement form a short sequence: 29 shows the active effect of prayer as a catastasis of the intellect on earthly thoughts - it destroys them. Sentence 30 allows something to happen to prayer as an intellectual state - it fades away or dies, but as a unique, extraordinary event, namely through ecstasy. It is difficult to precisely determine the reference of μόνον - should it distinguish genuine from falsely derived ecstasy? Or is it to designate more generally the unique, positive condition under which the state of prayer can fade away without the all too easily occurring descent into the realm of earthly and therefore distracting thoughts?

The Syriac monks naturally read the sentence 30 with the participle ܠܡܕܥܬܐ and assumed the connotations given by the verbum for their interpretations. Babai's commentary uses the possible meanings

almost against the obvious sense of the text, which was as objectionable to him as it was to the Greek tradition, which is available in Muylderman's edition. And herein lies the real reason for Frankenberg's abandonment of a retroversion of the participle: he felt the discrepancy between the scopus of Euagrius and the tendentious criticism of his commentator, but was so influenced by the latter that he could not decide in favor of Euagrius. Babai prefaces the small group 29-33 with the definitions of prayer with an introductory remark²⁵: "And by

²⁵ Syriac Frankenberg p. 454 above; the German translation 453 below is not accurate enough.

He distinguishes kinds of prayer by which we are brought near to God²⁶ through grace-bringing intercourse, he says:" and now follows sentence 29. To this sentence the commentator devotes an interpretation that fills the negative statement positively²⁷: "So spiritual prayer, which (is) incorporeal, which is free from all distractions; and man is in a pure way with God in his intercourse. This is united when, through the gathering together of all distractions and through the light that shines on the praying mind

(ἡ ἁπλῆ) falls, be destroyed (ἡ ἀπὸ παντὸς) away from every sight all thoughts that are accustomed to earthly things (and) are concerned with vanities."

With the introduction of sentence 30, Babai already sets the course for his interpretation²⁸: "And by repeating the saying", namely 29, "in another way for explanation, he says:" (sentence 30 follows). So Babai does not want to see a new thought in c. 30, but a repetition of what Euagrius had already said in c. 29. This has the effect that the commentator says more broadly what he has already said in the explanation of 29, but now includes all the verbal elements of c. 30 in it.

including ὁμοῦ[24]tive as well as passive - but all slightly shifted or even reversed in their conceptual function. The adjective used by Babai

"natural" means the original human state as *imago dei*, "unnatural" its corruption. Since Babai, as I said, wants to insinuate that Euagrius is saying the same thing here as before, the point of view that prayer leaves aside everything earthly also plays a role in this explanation. Babai's commentary on c. 30 reads²⁹:

"This is the blissful prayer (, of which applies), completely (ἡ ἁπλῆ) man inclines his mind with his senses to the sublime vision, and there is nothing that interrupts (!, ὁμοῦ) and hinders him while he is in his natural state (ἡ ἀπὸ παντὸς)

in which he is the pleasing image through the graces of the venerable

Dominion, which (sc. the state) separates (ἡ ἀπὸ παντὸς) him from all expressions of movement and unrest of unnaturalness. Only (ἡ ἀπὸ παντὸς)through (ἡ ἀπὸ παντὸς) the wonderful (ἡ ἀπὸ παντὸς) and inexpressible ecstasy (ἡ ἀπὸ παντὸς), through the own light (ἡ ἀπὸ παντὸς) of the holy Trinity (see c. 30), which falls on the soul, is it cut off (! ἡ ἀπὸ παντὸς) from all fleeting and disturbing connections and material impressions and united with God in one spirit in the vision of his radiant beauty, (with God,) the giver of all delightful delights."

We see that Babai, unlike the traditional Greek version of c. 30, does not delete ecstasy, indeed that he also regards it as something extraordinary: in it man is as in the state before the fall. Prayer understood in this way unites with God. - One is reminded of various statements from the writings of Euagrius on prayer, not only those already quoted above. Since Babai defines prayer (naturally

²⁶ Cf. De oratione c. 65: If you want to pray, do nothing that is contrary to prayer, ἵνα ὁ θεὸς ἐγγίσας συμπορεύσῃ σοι. With συμπορεύσῃ think of the Emmaus story from Lk. 24!

²⁷ 27 Frankenberg p. 454/455

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid. The German translation is not specific enough.

in its highest degree, which he does not specifically say) as ecstasy, on the one hand this ecstasy cannot represent the "interruption" of the state of prayer; on the other hand it cannot itself be interrupted. Thus Babai must understand the participle ܠܥܡܕܐܢܐ of the euagrian sentence differently; he takes it literally as "cut off" (like householder!) and, in consequence of his thesis that sentences 29 and 30 say the same thing, as analogous to the verbal adjective ܡܕܥܠܝܐ , "destroying", of c. 29. Prayer as ecstasy "cuts off" the soul from earthly thoughts.

[25] II

We find another, by no means negative, way of dealing with Euagrius' sentence in Isaac of Nineveh. I do not need to refer here in full to Khalifé- Hachem's explanations³⁰ in which he clarifies the relationship between "pure prayer" and "spiritual prayer" in Isaac. On the basis of the material quoted and reflected upon in this essay and its examination against the original, it has become clear to me that Isaac belongs to those monastic authors who attempt to balance the spirituality of Euagrius and that of Theodore of Mopsuestia - the latter entirely determined by eschatology³¹. The eschatological moment has been seen by Khalifé-Hachem, but not the relationship to Theodore that lies therein (incidentally, the latter is described as a

"blessed interpreter" De perf. rel. p. 168 mentioned below³³). [26] See the passage from

³⁰ See above n. 10.

³¹ S. I. Oñatibia, *La vida christiana, tipo de las realidades celestes. Un concepto basico de la teologia de Teodoro de Mopsuestia*, Scriptorium Victoriense I (1954), p. 100-133, in my essay quoted after the special print p. 1-34; L. Abramowski, *Zur Theologie Theodors von Mopsuestia*, ZKG 72 (1961) p. 263-293 (English in the anthology *Formula and Context. Studies in early Christian thought* [Variorum, Coll. St. Ser. 365], Aldershot 1992).

³² Cf. L. Abramowski, *Dadisho Qatraya and his Commentary on the Book of the Abbas Isaiah, The Harp* (Kottayam, Kerala) 4 (1991) p. 67-83 [here in this volume pp. 293-304]. - Unlike Dadisho, Isaac does not engage in a polemical dispute with the "schoolmen" and does not attempt a re-interpretation of Theodore, but quotes him as an authority in religiosis with the same self-confidence as Euagrius. Incidentally, the quotations from Theodore do not concern eschatology.

³³ With the help of Wensinck's index, which as already mentioned gives Bedjan's page number, one can find the usual mentions of the "blessed interpreter" and any associated quotations. The personal name and the title of bishop with the epithet "light of the whole world" are also mentioned once. For the majority of the quotations, no location is given, but once the Genesis commentary and once the Matthew commentary. In Isaac's 19th treatise, which deals with revelations and the effects of images in the saints, there are explanations (Bedjan p. 155-159) about categories of revelations etc., for which the [26] author refers to Theodore: one can learn this from the writings of "the world-famous blessed bishop Theodore", he speaks "about the manner and order of the revelations especially in the three volumes on Genesis and in the two on Job and in the last on the Twelve (sc. Prophets) and in the commentary on Acta and that on Matthew". Bedjan p. 159 f. discusses the difference between revelations in images and without images: This is clearly shown by "the blessed interpreter in the second volume of Job". - This all seems to me to indicate that Isaac knew Theodore's Exegetica well; the usual way of acquiring this knowledge consisted in attending

De perfectione religiosa p. 508 (upper half): "Prayer is emptiness of thought (, emptiness) of all that (concerns) things here below, and a heart that turns its gaze fully to the longing of hope for what is to come³⁴". The spiritual phase of prayer coincides with life in the New World after the Resurrection", says Khalifé-Hachem³⁵ and continues: "Isaac is very clear on this point; [27] every time he has to speak of this phase, he hastens to add that it belongs to the future life after the Resurrection". Khalifé- Hachem gives³⁶ a very characteristic quotation from De perf. rel. p. 304 (below); where he translates "Commentateur lumineux" (which would be Theodore of Mopsuestia!), it actually means "enlightened commentary".³⁷ I suspect that this is Babai's commentary on the Centuries of Euagrius - but which, the "short" one preserved to us or the lost "long" one? In any case, as quoted from the commentary, the keyword "ecstasy" ܐܨܬܬܐܠܗܐ). The text of Isaac reads: "From here on, it (the intellect)³⁸ will easily be set in motion towards³⁹ what is called unique knowledge⁴⁰ which, according to (what is) (said) in the enlightened commentary, is ecstasy in

in the school, which is probably to be assumed for Isaac. - I would also like to take this opportunity to mention that Wensinck's register provides us with a quotation from Diodorus of Tarsus (Bedjan p. 285) which, as far as I can see, has not yet been noted. Diodorus is described as "skilled in dialectics (or: eloquence?)" and as a "master of discernment". The content is ascetic and deals with judgment, which suggests the probable origin of the writing "De providentia". Since Wensinck's translation of the second half of the quotation is inadequate, I give here my translation of the whole excerpt: "Support of the body in its softness and tenderness quickly gives the soul a sensitivity to suffering, and it laments death because of it, and it fearfully receives the judgment of God. The soul, however, which constantly thinks with care about what is proper, is calm in itself, and its worries are insignificant" (i.e. before judgment), "in that it has no remorse (= nothing to regret)". The series of quotations I - IV from Diodorus' De providentia counted by H. G. Weis is thus increased by a number V. No. IV from Dadisho Qatraya, published by Weis in a manuscript, can now be found in Draguet's edition of Dadisho in CSCO 326/327. H. G. Weis, Diodorus of Tarsus, Περὶ πρόνοιας, in: Paul de Lagarde und die syrische Kirchengeschichte, Göttingen 1968, p. 217-230.

34 Z. Partly quoted by Khalifé-Hachem (see above n. 10) p. 159.

35 Ibid. p. 163.

36 Ibid.

37 Wensinck p. 203 has "a clear interpretation".

38 Thus Khalifé-Hachem; Wensinck p. 203 has the neutral "one" (German: "man"). - Shortly before Isaac speaks twice of ܐܬܬܐܠܗܐ, "theoria of themselves"; Wensinck translates as "personal contemplation", a characteristic example of how misleading the mechanical translation of ܐܬܬܐܠܗܐ as "person" is.

39 I take ܐܬܬܐܠܗܐ here as a "preposition of movement", cf. Payne-Smith / Margoliouth s.v., b): "to, unto". [The group of characters ܐܬܬܐܠܗܐ (placed here in cruces), in the original article directly before the footnote, but without an equivalent in the underlying Syriac text, is to be deleted - *ed.*]

40 In the commentary on Cent. V 55 (Frankenberg p. 340 last line / p. 343 above) I find as euagriacal expression ܐܬܬܐܠܗܐ, ܐܬܬܐܠܗܐ, in a quotation from II 3. If you look it up, you will find the fuller expression ܐܬܬܐܠܗܐ, ܐܬܬܐܠܗܐ, ܐܬܬܐܠܗܐ. The commentary on V 55 also quotes I 88. None of the three Euagrius texts and the associated interpretations contain ܐܬܬܐܠܗܐ "ecstasy".

God is, i.e. the order of the future (life) walk, which is given in the freedom of life in immortality in that walk after the resurrection". (The explanation of Isaac to Euagrius and Babai begins with "i.e.").

Here on earth, this may be achieved by one in a thousand. Also, to quote Khalifé-Hachem again⁴¹, "the paradisiacal state is apparently not a stable one in this life". According to Isaac, it is a "symbol 𐤀𐤓𐤀 of the being of that future change" (De perf. rel. p. 260.4 f.).

[28] The "spiritual prayer" of Isaac is a phase beyond "pure prayer".

"In spiritual prayer the intellect is completely absorbed by the spirit as in the life to come⁴²". We read in Isaac (De perf rel. p. 170,2 ff.⁴³): "De même que les saints *dans le monde* nouveau⁴⁴, lorsque *l'intellect est absorbé*⁴⁵ par l'Esprit, ne prient plus, mais, dans l'extase⁴⁶, se reposent dans cette gloire délicieuse, ainsi, quand *l'intellect* est jugé digne de percevoir ce bonheur futur, *il s'oublie lui-même* avec toutes les choses d'ici-bas. Il n'est plus mis en branle dorénavant par l'idée de quelque chose". - So here we find statements about the effects of ecstasy on the intellect in relation to prayer. - "If spiritual prayer is not prayer", says Khalifé-Hachem about Isaac's opinion⁴⁷, "it nevertheless occurs through the intervention of the spirit during prayer". And furthermore⁴⁸: It is called prayer out of the embarrassment of finding an appropriate name for this state.

"La prière spirituelle s'exprime concrètement dans l'âme dans un état d'extase (tehrō) provoqué par l'amour de Dieu. Cet état est accompagné d'un apaisement total physique et mentale".

Isaac has compiled a small Euagrius-Florileg in treatise or chapter 22, which contains, among other things, Supplement 30⁴⁹. The passage of interest to us here, De perf. rel. p. 173 below to p. 175, was translated in small part by Khalifé-Hachem and in large part by Hausherr. The first and last quotations from Euagrius have already been identified by the various experts, and the two in between have also been found.

[29] Bedjan p. 173: (Isaac) "What is the time that is (so) holy and suitable for sanctification and the reception of the gifts as the time of prayer in which man converses with God? (Suitable) because in this period of time,

⁴¹ Khalifé-Hachem p. 164.

⁴² Ibid. p. 165.

⁴³ In Khalifé-Hachem p. 165, n. 25 and 26, p. 169 is given.

⁴⁴ The emphasis in the translation is mine.

⁴⁵ 𐤀𐤓𐤀, "entwined".

⁴⁶ 𐤀𐤓𐤀.

⁴⁷ Khalifé-Hachem p. 166.

⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 167.

⁴⁹ With the help of Wensinck's register, further Euagrius quotations or mentions of his name are findable. I have not investigated whether anyone has turned their attention to them yet.

which consists in supplication to God, and supplication and conversation with him, and every emotion and (every) thought of man from everywhere is compellingly gathered there and he thinks and seeks grace in God (p.174) alone, also his whole thinking is engulfed⁵⁰ in conversation with him and his heart is filled with him. From here also the Holy Spirit produces in him (sc. man) some intangible intellections⁵¹, according to the measure (= the ability) of man to produce (them, i.e. the intellections) in him⁵³, in that he (the Spirit) takes occasion from what he (man) asks, so that prayer is cut off⁵⁴ from self-movement⁵⁵ by these intellections and the intellect is engulfed⁵⁶ by ecstasy and the longing for what is asked for is forgotten. And in deep drunkenness his faculties sink, and he is not in this world. And therefore there is no distinction between the body and the soul and no memory of anything. As Euagrius says: (Suppl. sentence 30 follows, see above p. 1 [here in this volume p. 196]). (Isaac) You have seen how prayer is interrupted⁵⁷ by the ecstasy of intellections, those produced by prayer in thought, as I said at the beginning of the treatise and in many places up to here. Again he says (Euagrius, Suppl. 4): 'The catastasis of the intellect is the height of the intelligibles, which is comparable to the color of the sky, over which rises in the time of prayer the light of the [30] holy Trinity⁵⁸'. (Isaac:) And when is man worthy of all this grace, that he is raised to this greatness in the time of prayer? He says (Euagrius, Suppl. 25): 'When the intellect puts off the old man, and puts on the new by grace, then also (p. 175) he sees his state in the time of prayer, resembling the sapphire, or color of heaven, which was called the place of God by the elders of Israel, who appeared to them on the mount'. (Isaac:) So, if I have said that it is not proper to call this spiritual gift prayer - but what (then)? The product of pure prayer, swallowed up in the Spirit

50 ܬܠܝܬ, cf. n. 45 above.

51 This translation of ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ (which are regarded here as spirit-worked) according to Beulay, to distinguish them from mere ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ.

52 Aph. of the root ܬܠ, "to move", = "to be moved".

53 = n. 52.

54 ܬܠܝܬܐܬܐ

55 On "cut off from self-mobility" cf. Babai's commentary on Suppl. 30 and the dor-understanding of "cut off".

56 As n. 45.

57 ܬܠܝܬܐܬܐ

58 The original of this is now available: Muyldermans, Euagria, p. 38 number δ' and p. 15 no. 3. The two versions correct each other, s. the apparatus This is how to read: νοῦ κατάστασις ἐστὶν ὕψος νοητὸν οὐρανίῳ χρώματι παρεμφερές ᾧ καὶ τὸ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς προσευχῆς ἐπιγίνεται φῶς. - Syriac has apparently found the plural genitive νοητῶν for νοητόν (or does it prefer this understanding?). On ὕψος νοητόν see above n. 23, Prayer Scripture c. 52.

is⁵⁹. The intellect has thus reached a point above prayer, and in finding something better⁶⁰ prayer leaves it. And from then on he does not pray in the proper sense, but it is a gazing through ecstasy⁶¹ at inscrutable things that are not of the mortal world. And he is silent in the non-recognition of all that is here. This is the unknowing of which it is said: Blessed is he who has encountered the unpassable unknowing, the one in prayer, as Euagrius said (Cent. III 88)⁶²." [31] Isaac therefore does not see ecstasy as something within prayer, as Babai interpreted Euagrius' sentence, but as something on the basis of prayer.

"above" (not outside!) of it. He has no doubt read Babai's comment and loyally adopts his understanding of ܠܡܕܥܬܝܬܐ as "cut off"; he also applies the participle like Babai to earthly things. Of course, this does not prevent Isaac from using ܠܡܕܥܬܝܬܐ as it is meant in Euagrius' text: as interruption, being interrupted, cessation, and from this to draw the conclusion for the intellect and prayer through this intervention of the divine: he and it are "swallowed up".

Finally, John of Dalyatha read Isaac and Euagrius. Ep. 12,3 begins: "Prayer is, he says, purity of the intellect, whose (sc. of prayer⁶³) prayer movements do not cease⁶⁴ unless under the rising of the holy light of the Trinity above the intellect. For he says: "Prayer is interrupted by the ecstasy that (happens) through the light". Beulay has the first of the two

⁵⁹ ܠܡܕܥܬܝܬܐ.

⁶⁰ ܡܠܥܬܝܬܐ.

⁶¹ ܠܡܕܥܬܝܬܐ.

⁶² The source of this sentence in Euagrius was proven by I. Hausherr, "Ignorance infinie".

OCP 2 (1936) p. 351-361 (= Hésychasme et prière, see above n. 5, p. 38-49), and likewise by Guillaumont, PO 28,1 p. 134 n. 2. In 1926 Hausherr endeavors to prove that the statement in this form is compatible with the other teachings of Euagrius. Guillaumont considers the "non-recognition" of the version S₁ to be an easily explainable reading (l.c. n. 1). The reading requires the optional spelling

ܠܡܕܥܬܝܬܐ for ܠܡܕܥܬܝܬܐ (alph as a mater lectionis placed before the yod). With the prefigured dative lamad, the longer spelling results in ܠܡܕܥܬܝܬܐ, which could easily be split into two words: ܠܡܕܥܬܝܬܐ becomes a ne[31]gation and requires another lamad to indicate the case. S₂ has ܠܡܕܥܬܝܬܐ and Armenian "à la science" to match it exactly. After the publication of Guillaumont's

Hausherr took up the problem again in the 5th edition of the Centuries of Cephalaia gnostica (1958) (Ignorance infinie ou science infinie, OCP 25, 1959, p. 44-52: Hésychasme et prière p. 238-246). Hausherr wishes to hold on to his old view; he plays down the extraordinary importance of Guillaumont's discovery of the unmitigated version, even though the Greek sentences of Euagrius published by Hausherr after a Moscow publication in OCP 5 (1939) confirmed the version S₂ as a translation of the original, which he could easily have ascertained by reading Guillaumont's notes. What he says on the second page of the essay about the Syriac transliteration possibilities omits the decisive steps; the differences he mentions between the letter forms in Estrangelo and Serto are irrelevant to the problem.

⁶³ The feminine suffix in Syriac formally refers either to "prayer" (Syriac feminine) or "prayer" (Syriac feminine). on "purity", in terms of content on "prayer", not on "intellect".

⁶⁴ ܡܠܥܬܝܬܐ i.e. another synonym for the phenomenon.

Sentences highlighted by citation marks, not the second. The second sentence is, of course, a highly abbreviated rendering of Euagrius Suppl. 30, so the author "he" in it is [32] Euagrius. The first sentence contains elements of Suppl. 30, but is also reminiscent of Isaac (the prayer movements!) - Beulay's way out,

To translate "he says" as "one says" is quite appropriate for the not very great precision in quotation as practiced here by John of Dalayatha.

In John we sense nothing of the eschatological reservation under which Isaac places ecstasy. But if Isaac could have known him, he would probably have admitted that John is one of the vanishingly few to whom such ecstasy is granted.

As far as the *modus traditionis* is concerned, the short formula for Suppl. 30 in John characterizes the opposite end of the spectrum of Euagrius' reception to the Greek reduced form of the sentence: complete assent.

3.5 Martyrius-Sahdona and Dissent in the Church of the East

Summary: Martyrius-Sahdona seems to be the only one among the exponents of the christology of the one hypostasis in the East Syrian Church of whom a complete text has survived, a chapter "On faith" in his *Book of Perfection*. Others of the same conviction (but here we are completely dependent on polemics) propagated the one hypostasis as a composite one like the Greek neo-Chalcedonians. In this respect Sahdona differs from them. Except in the matter of the one hypostasis his christology is of East Syrian hue, as has been demonstrated by de Halleux against older opinions. What has not been noticed before is Sahdona's use of the spurious introduction (Ps.-Nestorius) to the *Liber Heraclidis* of Nestorius, important to Sahdona because of two tiny interpolations in the sense of the Chalcedonian one hypostasis. These interpolations determine Sahdona's reception of a text whose authority his opponents were not in a position to contest. [14]

Damnatio memoriae has dealt very effectively with the writings of those teachers and monks in the Church of the East who taught that the divine-human unity of Christ's person should be understood as one *prosopon* and one hypostasis, *qnoma* in Syriac. Good luck, however, has preserved one complete text originating from this school of thought: a chapter in the *Book of Perfection* by Martyrius-Sahdona, thus in a spiritual tractate destined for monks.¹ The monk Sahdona became bishop between 635 and 640; it was the catholicos Isho'yahb III (died in 6592) who finally exiled the obstinate bishop to the west, the west being in this case Edessa. The reason why christology has its own chapter in Sahdona's book is the author's plan to treat the virtues one by one in the second part of his work, after having written about them in general in the first part. He therefore starts with faith in chapter 2 of the second part, under the heading "On the true faith and the sane profession of orthodoxy". The contents follow the traditional order: God (§ 2-8), Trinity (one nature in three hypostases, § 9-18), oikonomia

Note: [The French and German versions of the summary from the original article have been deleted here, the bibliography on pages 25-27 of the original article has been incorporated into the notes - *editor's note*].

1 de Halleux 1961 [A. de Halleux, *Martyrius (Sahdona). Œuvres spirituelles* II. *Livre de la perfection 2e partie* (ch. 1-7) (CSCO 214, script. syr. 90), Louvain, 1961; *ibid.* (CSCO 215, script. syr. 91), Louvain, 1961 - *the ed.*], p. 8-25 *textus*, p. 8-25 *versio*.

2 So according to Fiey 1970 [J.-M. Fiey, "Ṭšō'yaw le grand. Vie du catholicos nestorien Ṭšō'yaw III d'Adiabène (580-659)", *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 36, 1970, p. 5-46 - *ed.*], p. 7, where the author tries to work out an "approximately reasonable" chronology of the catholicos Isho'yahb II, Mar Emmeh and Isho'yahb III.

in Christ (§ 19-38, the longest section); the Last Things are not taking up much place: §40-41.³

All important work on Sahdona has been done by André de Halleux. He analyzed Sahdona's christology in 1957;⁴ in 1958 he deconstructed the work of his predecessors on the biography of Sahdona, whose method "semble avoir été jusqu'ici celle du concordisme", and then gathered together the strands of the diverse trustworthy sources.⁵ Jean-Maurice Fiey however stated some disagreement with de Halleux in chronological [15] matters.⁶ Quite correctly de Halleux calls the life of Sahdona a "vie mouvementée". Indeed Isho'yahb, battling with Sahdona when still a metropolitan, claims in his letter to the bishops of Beth-Garmai "on Sahdona" (II, 30) that Sahdona accepted the faith of the church on eight occasions, three times with his signature and seal, five times by oral confession before the synod - and that he as many times returned to this error.⁷

De Halleux also has given us the critical edition and translation of Sahdona's *Œuvres spirituelles* in four volumes in CSCO, from 1960 to 1965; the *Book of Perfection* fills three of them.⁸ Since then Sebastian Brock found "A further fragment of the Sinai Sahdona manuscript" and published it in 1968.⁹ The "discovery" "demands a reconsideration of de Halleux's ordering" of some pages of Sahdona's text; Brock supplies

3 Chapter 2 has 47 paragraphs.

4 de Halleux 1957 [A. de Halleux, "La christologie de Martyrius-Sahdona dans l'évolution du nestorianisme", *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 23, 1957, p. 5-32 - *the editor*].

5 de Halleux 1958 [A. de Halleux, "La vie mouvementée d'un 'hérétique' de l'église nestorienne", *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 24, 1958, p. 93-128 - *the ed.*]; the quotation p. 94, the résumé p. 125-128. **6** Fiey 1970 [as note 2 - *the ed.*] 'p. 19 n. 4. I do not propose to go into these differences and their reasons. Fiey by the way declares himself not to be competent "d'étudier si Sahdona était vraiment chalcédonien ou autre chose" (p. 19).

7 Duval 1904 [R. Duval, *Išō'yahb Patriarchae III Liber Epistularum* [CSCO 11, script. syr. 11], Louvain, 1904], p. 209,23-28 textus; Duval 1905 [R. Duval, *Išō'yahb Patriarchae III Liber Epistularum* (CSCO 12, script. syr.12), Louvain 1905 - *the ed.*], p. 152,19-23 versio. The collection of letters is divided into three parts: I. letters of the bishop, II. letters of the metropolitan, III. letters of the catholicos. Fiey prefers to designate the parts with the abbreviations B., M., C. and adds Roman numerals; in this he is followed by Winkler 2001 [D. W. Winkler, "Die Christologie des ostsyrischen Katholikos Išhō'yaw III. von Adi-abene (580-659)", *Studia Patristica* 35, Leuven, 2001, p. 516-526 - *the editor*]. In their papers ep. II, 30 becomes M. XXX etc., not very helpful I find, I therefore keep to the practice of de Halleux.

8 de Halleux 1960 [A. de Halleux, *Martyrius (Sahdona). Œuvres spirituelles I. Livre de la perfection 1e partie* (CSCO 200, script. syr. 86), Louvain, 1960; *ibid.* (CSCO 201, script. syr. 87), Louvain, 1960], 1961 [A. de Halleux, *Martyrius (Sahdona). Œuvres spirituelles II. Livre de la perfection 2e partie* (ch. 1-7) (CSCO 214, script. syr. 90), Louvain, 1961; *ibid.* (CSCO 215, script. syr. 91), Louvain, 1961], 1965a [A. de Halleux, *Martyrius (Sahdona). Œuvres spirituelles III. Livre de la perfection 2e partie* (ch. 8-14) (CSCO 252, script. syr. 110), Louvain, 1965; *ibid.* (CSCO 253, script. syr. 111), Louvain, 1965]. Brock 1968 [S. Brock, "A further fragment of the Sinai Sahdona manuscript", *Le Muséon* 81, 1968, p. 139-154 - *d. Editor*].

9 Brock 1968 [see note 7 - *the editor*].

the rearrangement in his own translation.¹⁰ De Halleux himself published another "Chapitre retrouvé" of Sahdona's work in 1975.¹¹ This chapter has been transmitted as an independent Memra; judged by internal criteria its place is in the first part, second treatise, of the *Book*, between the existing chapters 3 and 7.¹² - In addition to this there has to be considered the proposal of Fiey that the true author of Isho'yahb's letter III, 22 (the last of the collection) could be Sahdona.¹³

[16] De Halleux's paper on the christology of Sahdona is implicitly as well as explicitly a critique on Wilhelm de Vries's view of Sahdona as expressed in "Die syrisch-nestorianische Haltung zu Chalkedon" of 1951.¹⁴ De Vries took Sahdona to be

"the main representative of anti-Nestorian christology in the Persian Church".¹⁵ He therefore only could find it "strange" when in this so-called anti-Nestorian he has to state "Nestorian expressions", though he kindly assumes that Sahdona's intention are the right ones; so de Vries goes on interpreting expressions to him strongly objectionable *in bonam partem* - all because of Sahdona's one hypostasis. "Nestorian" under the plume of de Vries has the strongest possible heresiological connotation, it expresses *per se* rejection.

De Halleux is unable to find monophysite or Chalcedonian traits in Sahdona's christology. The one hypostasis excepted, his views are those of the Nestorian theology of the ^{viii}th century. "The basic line of his theology even excludes a Chalcedonian origin".¹⁶ The so-called "Chalcedonian" tendencies in the Church of the East are considered by de Halleux to have arisen in this church itself.¹⁷ He even discusses a possible contribution by Theodore of Mopsuestia, taking into account the Syriac translation of

10 Brock 1968 [as note 7 - *ed.*], p. 150-154.

11 de Halleux 1975 [A. de Halleux, "Un chapitre retrouvé du Livre de la perfection de Martyrius", *Le Muséon* 88, 1975, p. 253-296 - *the editor*].

12 de Halleux 1975 [as note 11 - *ed.*], p. 259 f.

13 First hinted at Fiey 1970 [as note 2 - *the ed.*], p. 20 n. 1, discussed at greater length p. 24-25. The title of the letter differs from all the others, beginning "Copy (šḥḥ) of a letter written ...", while all the letters in part III have a title beginning "To (*lwt*) ...". One can easily agree when Fiey considers the letter to be "a piece added to the dossier" (p. 24). Fiey's doubts concern the writer's account of his time in prison and in exile, first in Nisibis, then in Edessa (the letter is written to Edessa). All of this has no confirmation from other sources (p. 24 f.) and seems to fit rather Sahdona's biography than Isho'yahb's. The long theological part of the letter Fiey leaves to a theologian to judge from the Syriac text whether the writer is an orthodox Nestorian or not (p. 25). The answer is simple: yes, the writer of the letter is an orthodox Nestorian. But even this, Fiey argues, does not need to speak against Sahdona as author, since he has changed his opinion often enough. I cannot decide the matter here; the [16] manner of writing seems to me very much like Isho'yahb's in the corpus of his letters.

14 de Vries 1951 [W. de Vries, "Die syrisch-nestorianische Haltung zu Chalkedon", in A. Grillmeier / H. Bacht (eds.), *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart* I, Würzburg, 1951, p. 603-635 - *the ed.*], on Sahdona p. 629-634.

15 de Vries 1951 [as note 14 - *ed.*], p. 629.

16 de Halleux 1957 [as note 4 - *ed.*], p. 24.

17 de Halleux 1958 [as note 5 - *ed.*], p. 128.

De incarnatione, preserved in parts in Brit. Libr. add. 14.669. He says: "According to a certain tradition, Theodore of Mopsuestia would have maintained the unicity of the hypostasis in Christ. The testimonies of this tradition probably conserve the precious vestiges of a formula familiar to the great Interpreter".¹⁸ And Marcel Richard took the Syriac version as containing the authentic Theodorian formula for the unity in Christ and therefore Theodore as a forerunner of the Chalcedonian one hypostasis. But since then it has been demonstrated,¹⁹ that the relationship between the Greek and the Syriac version of the famous passage in *De incarnatione* is to be reversed: the *Greek* is authentic and not the hypothetical Greek underlying the Syriac of add. 14.669.²⁰ An astounding ("astonishing" is too weak an expression) - an astounding fact is that the encyclopaedia of Theodore bar Koni (^{viii}th century) has knowledge only of this clumsy [17] translation of his famous namesake's treatise.²¹ It is not surprising that in IX, 4 he puts the embarrassing question: "When the blessed Interpreter and the fathers before him used the term 'one hypostasis' in Christ, why do we reject it now?" But Joseph Ḥazzaya in the late ^{viii}th century knew of both versions, for he declared the "one hypostasis" in Theodore's text to be a falsification by the first translator.²²

In his paper of 1957 de Halleux assumed that there was for some time a co-existence between the christologies of the one and of the two hypostases in the East Syrian church.²³ Did he understand this co-existence to have been a peaceful one? But did such a period ever exist? For from the time of Ḥenana (director of the school of Nisibis

¹⁸ de Halleux 1957 [as note 4 - *the ed.*], p. 26 n. 1.

¹⁹ By R. Köbert in a manuscript sent to A. Grillmeier and taken up by me, see the following note.

²⁰ Abramowski 1993 [L. Abramowski, "On the fragments of Theodore of Mopsuestia in Brit. Libr. add. 12156 and the christological fragment in double tradition", *The Harp* 6, 1993, p. 199-206]; German translation with notes added Abramowski 1995 [L. Abramowski, "Über die Fragmente des Theodor von Mopsuestia in Brit. Libr. add. 12.156 und das doppelt überlieferte christologische Fragment", *Oriens Christianus* 79, 1995, p. 1-8, in this volume pp. 22-28 - *the ed.*]; on Köbert p. 1 f.

²¹ Abramowski 1993 [L. Abramowski, "Die Reste der syrischen Übersetzung von Theodor von Mopsuestia, *De incarnatione*, in add. 14.669", *Aram* 5, 1993 (FS S. Brock), p. 23-32] (1996), on Bar Koni, p. 30 f. [in this volume pp. 29-36, here p. 34 f. - *the editor*].

²² Scher 1910 [A. Scher, "Joseph Ḥazzaya, écrivain syriaque du ^{viii}e siècle", *Rivista degli studi orientali* 3, 1910, p. 45-63 - *the editor*]. The dates given by Scher to Joseph Ḥazzaya and Theodore bar Koni have to be reversed: Joseph Ḥazzaya belongs to the second half of the ^{viii}th century, and Theodor bar Koni to the ^{viii}th. The Syriac version of Theodore's *De incarnatione* teaching *one* hypostasis in Christ is as far as I can see attested in a fourfold manner:

1. by the remains of a ms. of it in Brit. Libr. add. 14.669;
2. by the ms. described by Scher, then in the library at Séert; lost in the First War. The learned Chaldaean archbishop of Séert himself was killed in a massacre;
3. by Joseph Ḥazzaya in the ^{viii}th century;
4. by Theodore bar Koni in the ^{viii}th century. Of his ms. Scher says p. 63: "partout où il parle de l'union, il dit qu'il y a dans le Christ une seule hypostase (ܡܬܠܐ ܕܚܝܬܐ)".

²³ de Halleux 1957 [as note 4 - *ed.*], p. 29.

from 572 until 610) onwards both schools of thought were attacking each other until the final victory of the christology of the two hypostases in the one Christ.

Is there any discernible influence of the Syriac version of Theodore's *De incarnatione* represented by add. 14.669 on these developments? We have already seen that the *authentic* Theodore can be excluded from being a possible starting point of the christology of the one hypostasis with the East Syrians. Concerning the christology of the two hypostases it is well known that it became the official doctrine of the Church of the East with the document of the year 612. But in 1969/70 Antoine Guillaumont published an excerpt of a dialogue between the emperor Justinian and a number of Greek theologians on the one side and a delegation of Persian bishops on the other, the latter invited by the emperor, he himself being an important theologian of neo-Chalcedonian stamp.²⁴ The excerpt begins with the problem of two hypostases, or more exactly in a polemical formulation of the same problem by the emperor (§ 1):²⁵ the body which the God Logos [18] assumed in the incarnation, was it another man,²⁶ perceived in his own hypostasis external to him? The answer of the "Nestorian" (§ 2), as he is called in the text, does not bother to refute the term "external" but begins with Philippians 2 and the confession of the undivided union in Christ, then turns the table on the "Orthodox" and asks for an explanation of *his* christology. Later on the

"Nestorian" firmly confesses (§ 10.33): Christ is two hypostases and two natures and the two hypostases are one *prosopon*. The "Orthodox" offers his own solution to the problem of the union of two natures in the one Christ (§ 13): the *hypostasis synthetos*. The excerpt is handed down in a monophysite manuscript which certainly explains the selection of the topics;²⁷ but even so there is no report of a condemnation by one party or the other attached to it. The Persian tradition also proudly remembers the doctrinal statement of the eastern delegates and their return home, amply honoured by their host.²⁸ The emperor's initiative, highly surprising in view of his synod of 553 with its condemnation of Theodore (who is spoken of in the Acts in the foulest language imaginable), is put into its political context by A. Guillaumont and its date

established: 562 or 563.

But at least as surprising as Justinian's initiative is the very fact that the delegates from the east were explaining their christology as one of two hypostases *at this time*.

²⁴ Guillaumont 1969/1970 [A. Guillaumont, "Justinien et l'Église de Perse", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23/24, 1969/1970, p. 39-66 - *the editor*].

²⁵ The numbering of the paragraphs is my own, it follows Guillaumont's alinéas which correspond to the change of speakers.

²⁶ The expression does not mean "a second man", but "another, (a) man".

²⁷ The topics are: the two hypostases and the "quaternity" in place of the Trinity, alleged by the "Orthodox". This latter part begins with § 18 and has its own title. § 35 (the last one) is an indication of a further subject treated by the participants: "Et il est encore demandé: y-a-t-il une hypostase née sans filiation? Et si pour chaque hypostase il y a une filiation, il est évident que cela fait deux Fils". The whole text (a reproduction of the Syriac is added by the editor) merits a detailed analysis.

²⁸ Guillaumont 1969/1970 [as note 24 - *ed.*], p. 50 f.

The eastern synods, with the exception of the one under the catholicos Acacius 486, did not even use the term *prosopon* for Christ before 585, let alone hypostasis. In this they follow a manner of speaking established by the Theodorians at the School of the Persians at Edessa and transferred to Nisibis by Narsai. The exchange of polemics between Philoxenus and Ḥabib, recently analyzed,²⁹ shows the existence of quite a distinct form of Antiochene christology in Syriac for the second half of the fifth century. A strict distinction of the language of *theologia* and *oikonomia* is required for the use of the term hypostasis: it is to be restricted to trinitarian doctrine, the christological use is not permitted. Thus the very sharply expressed dyophysite doctrine does neither take the form of the teaching of one hypostasis nor of two hypostases. Philoxenus claims a doctrine of two hypostases by Ḥabib, but does not quote a single line in proof of this, so there was none. This evidence is confirmed by Narsai's [19] christological homilies, enabling us to argue from a quantitatively broader basis of texts than that constituted by the excerpts from Ḥabib alone, also covering a longer period in time.³⁰ Both the monk Ḥabib and the teacher Narsai are even very sparing in their use of *prosopon*.

Compared with that the christology of the Persian delegates of 562/3 demonstrates a new element in the way the two natures in Christ are defined by the Easterns. The delegates, no doubt the best instructed among their colleagues, must have been quite familiar with what they were declaring with so much confidence. The terminology of the two hypostases is compared to that of the earlier Edessenian Theodorians a turning around by 180 degrees, but there is no change of the theological thinking behind it.

What is the source of this alteration of the traditional Edessenian-Nisibean terminology to a more complicated one? I know no other explanation than the introduction of the *Liber Heraclidis* of Nestorius into Persia, translated into Syriac in 539/40,³¹

²⁹ Abramowski 2002 [L. Abramowski, "Aus dem Streit um das 'Unus ex trinitate passus est': Der Pro- test des Ḥabib gegen die Epistula dogmatica des Philoxenus an die Mönche", in A. Grillmeier / Th. Hainthaler (eds.), *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* 2/3, Freiburg, 2002, p. 570-647 - the editor].

³⁰ A short paper on the Edessenian-Nisibean christology will appear in the forthcoming volume of the Halle conference on Edessa, held in 2005 [Edessa in Hellenistic-Roman Times: Religion, Culture and Politics between East and West; Contributions to the International Edessa Symposium in Halle an der Saale, July 14-17, 2005, edited by Lutz Greisiger, Beirut/Würzburg 2009, p. 1-9, here in this volume

A long chapter on Narsai and his and Ḥabib's christology is prepared for the projected volume on the Church of the East in Grillmeier / Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* [not yet published - ed.]

³¹ Macomber 1974 [W. F. Macomber, *Six Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts by Cyrus of Edessa, an East Syrian theologian of the mid-sixth century* (CSCO 355, script. syr. 155), Louvain, 1974; *ibid.* (CSCO 356, script. syr. 156), Louvain, 1974 - the ed.]. in his introduction, p. XII, gives that date as 537. He suggests Cyrus as a possible translator of the *Liber Heraclidis*, though there is no trace in the "Explanations" of the characteristic christological nomenclature of that book. Macomber translates trinitarian *qnoma* as "person", in the one christological occurrence as "substance", but considering also "hypostasis" (p. 139 n. 4). It seems to me that *qnwmh* here has the sense of "he himself".

evidently imported from Constantinople by Mar Aba.³² The leader of the Persian delegation at the colloquium with Justinian was a disciple of Mar Aba, bishop Paul of Nisibis (officiated 551-573).³³ It was this Paul who had ʿHenana removed from the school there because of the unorthodox christology proclaimed by him in public. It is easy to suppose that ʿHenana's dissent was a protest against the teaching of his metro-politan and thus an indirect sequel of the assimilation of the christology of the *Liber Heraclidis* by the higher clergy or at least by a part of it. But after the death of bishop Paul, ʿHenana became the director of the Nisibene school, so he must have had the necessary qualities for that office. Is it also an indication for the existence of a great number of doctrinal adherents in the school and in the town? The continuing polem-ics against ʿHenana suggest that he taught a composite hypostasis in Christ which of course has a very neo-Chalcedonian ring. If this term was not known to him before-hand there is a possible written source for his knowledge of the argumentation on the Greek side: the [20] report of bishop Paul on the colloquium, lost to us.³⁴ How one would have liked to compare that report with the excerpts published by Guillaumont! Bedjan as well as de Halleux think that Sahdona was taught in his youth at Nisibis; Fiey remains sceptical, since he did not find any testimony for this.³⁵ Though Sahdona is a proponent of the one hypostasis in Christ, he does *not* qualify it as "composite", neither in the *Book of Perfection*, nor does his opponent Isho'yahb reproach him with it. There are two tiny literal quotations from Sahdona (sadly without indication of the source and certainly not from the *Book*) in Isho'yahb's letter II, 7.³⁶ Both are expres-sions for "one hypostasis", the first is a synonym, *mqymwt' yhydyt'*), translated by Duval as *subsistentia unica*, the next is *qnwm' lhwdy'*, *hypostasis singularis*. In his "confession of the sane faith" in the "Book" the author rejects a possible composition in one *ousia*.

When I read Sahdona's chapter on the faith in preparation for this paper combined with a re-reading of de Halleux's pioneering article of 1957, I found to my great surprise that Sahdona has been a student of the Ps.-Nestorian introduction to the *Liber Heraclidis*, and that he used this part only of the *Liber* in his chapter. And he read that introduction (which is a treatise complete in itself) in the form we have it today,

³² See Abramowski 1963 [L. Abramowski, *Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius* (CSCO 242, Subsidia 22), Louvain, 1963 - ed.], p. 7-13.

³³ On Paul see Fiey 1977 [J.-M. Fiey, *Nisibe, métropole syrienne orientale et ses suffragants des origines à nos jours* (CSCO 388, Subsidia 54), Louvain, 1977 - ed.], 51-55. The date of his death (573) p. 55. ³⁴ About a possible (in the meantime lost) Arabic translation of this report see Fiey 1977 [as note 33 - ed.], p. 52 with n. 258.

³⁵ Fiey 1970 [as note 2 - ed.], p. 20 n. 1: "Le fait n'est mentionné ni dans ses notices biographiques ni dans ses œuvres. Le seul indice possible serait contenu dans la lettre attribuée à Išō'yaw, C. XXII, ou Sahdōna parlerait (si mon hypothèse est exacte) de 'notre Nisibe'; encore l'expression peut-elle s'entendre également en référence à l'orthodoxie nestorienne de la ville". (About the authorship of ep. III, 22 see already above).

³⁶ Duval 1904 [as note 7], p. 136.9 textus; Duval 1905 [as note 7 - ed.], p. 102.6 f. versio.

that is to say with two very small but highly problematic interpolations, both however central to Sahdona's christological thinking. One of the glosses is an unobtrusive "one hypostasis", *ḥd qnwm*, slipped in before *ḥd pršwp*.³⁷

In founding his christology on Ps.-Nestorius, Sahdona gained two advantages: he was able to dismiss any reproach of taking over (neo-)Chalcedonian tendencies, and over against those who wanted to press him into their own line of thinking he could point out that he was using the same book which served as source for the christology of two hypostases so what was wrong with that? - I am sorry to say that I have found no trace of an exchange of views in this manner, so it remains just a guess. Still, one could put the question, why Sahdona though exiled twice (once finally) was so often forgiven for backsliding into error. Did he promise to read further on in the *Liber Heraclidis* following an imaginable indication by his opponents that the latter and far larger part of the book contained the [21] final decisions of its author and that *these* were to be taken as the valid ones?

The second interpolation consists of two words in the last line (14) of Bedjan's p. 125, two adjectives following *lpršwp* of line 13. The adjectives are *kyny' wqnwmy*, "natural and hypostatic". Those are also the last words of the introduction to the *Liber Heraclidis*.³⁸ The authentic part begins on p. 126 under the heading '*l hymnwt*', "On the faith" (because "the faith of the 318 in Nicaea" is mentioned in line 2 f.). Whoever put that heading there must have been under the impression that at this point something distinct from the foregoing text was beginning.

Both interpolations mar the terminological consistency of Ps.-Nestorius and therefore the clarity of his thought. To perceive this we have to remember that Nestorius in his Second Apology, *i. e.* in the authentic part of the *Liber Heraclidis*, for his christology uses a scheme of individuation which runs *physis*, *hypostasis*, *prosopon*. With a consequence which is just lacking to the famous passage of Theodore's *De incarnatione*, he applies the scheme to *both* natures: two natures, two hypostases, two *prosopa* - and then his difficult task is to unify the two *prosopa* in the one *prosopon* of the one Christ.

The writer of the introduction for his part obviously felt the necessity to protect the book of Nestorius from the quite real danger of destruction on imperial territory by providing a harmless hermeneutical key to it. What he does is to cut out from the

³⁷ Bedjan 1910 [P. Bedjan (ed.), *Nestorius, Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas*. Paris, Leipzig, 1910 - ed.], p. 81.4 f. On this passage see Abramowski 1963 [see note 32 - *the ed.*], p. 183-185.

³⁸ With Bedjan 1910 [as note 37 - *the ed.*], p. 125,10 *mdyn* (Nau 1910 [F. Nau, *Nestorius, Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas*, avec le concours du R. P. Bedjan et de M. Brière, Paris, 1910 - *the ed.*], p. 81,16 "Par consequent") a new paragraph begins, of a summarizing character: "Therefore also in no other manner except this one we find the words of the divine scriptures apply to Christ, but as we have examined and found: that all do not fit the union of nature but the *prosopon* naturel et hypostatique" (I have made use of the French form of the adjectives to give them their syntactic position in analogy to the Syriac). In the preceding text the problem of the suffering of the Logos is treated.

original scheme the stratum of hypostasis; the remaining scheme reads: two natures, two *prosopa* - and then he also proceeds to unify the two *prosopa* in the one *prosopon* of the one Christ. On that difficult point he succeeds to develop a more satisfying solution than Nestorius himself. On the moot point of hypostasis he teaches neither one nor two hypostases. His avoidance of the term in christology reminds us of the Theodorians of Edessa and then of Nisibis, though they did not know the *Liber Heraclidis* before its discovery and subsequent translation into Syriac. But the great difference between them concerns the use of *prosopon*: prominent in Ps.-Nestorius, very rare with the Syriac Theodorians. Where and when to locate the writer of the two interpolations to the text of Ps.-Nestorius? His choice of the one hypostasis puts him into the [22] Chalcedonian camp. I would seek him in Constantinople (like Ps.-Nestorius), where alone the whole work was (secretly) available. In my opinion he intends to give the hermeneutical key a just perceptible further turn so to speak in the interest of the book's safety. The second interpolation seems to have been taken from the authentic Nestorius, and this as maladroitly as possible.³⁹ In any case, *prosopon physikon* in both, Nestorius and Ps.-Nestorius, belongs to the natures and not to the *prosopon* of union in Christ.⁴⁰

The inconsistencies of terminology and of meaning created by the interpolations in Ps.-Nestorius are not only mirrored but also enlarged in Sahdona. For him the "natural and hypostatic *prosopon*" expresses the unity in Christ, just as the interpolator intended. From easily overlooked additions to the text of Ps.-Nestorius, the interpolated words have become the center and the distinguishing traits of Sahdona's christology.

Most of the interesting things in Sahdona have been noted of course by de Halleux, but not the dependence on Ps.-Nestorius, because his article was published before my monograph of 1963 on the *Liber Heraclidis*, where I distinguished two main authors of that work. In my book I made use of de Halleux to explain the second interpolation, but took it at that time to be an insertion in the *Liber Heraclidis* by the circle of Sahdona.⁴¹

39 The second interpolation consisting of the two adjectives "naturel et hypostatique" seems to have been taken from the text of the authentic Nestorius, though *a contrario*: Bedjan 1910 [as note 37 - *the ed.*], p. 133, 13 f. Nestorius says: "Ils" (the opposite party) "détruisent tout cela par l'union naturelle

et hypostatique" (Nau: "personnelle"). The meaning of Nestorius is of course: the union is *not* one of nature or hypostasis. Two pages farther back (Bedjan 1910, p. 131) Nestorius insists on the "union volontaire" against the "union naturelle" - this (in connection with suffering) is also the subject of discussion by Ps.-Nestorius immediately before his concluding remark quoted by me in the note before this one. Thus the interpolator took that pair of adjectives from a context similar to his own and placed it next to his term of union, the *prosopon*. The authentic Nestorius develops the principles of his christology in Bedjan 1910, p. 128, 7 ff. ("Others again ..."): the two natures do not mix, but are one *prosopon* of the two natures, "while they both keep the proprieties of their natures" (p. 129, 2 f.).

40 Abramowski 1963 [as note 32 - *ed.*], p. 187 f. (Ps.-Nestorius) and p. 217 f. (Nestorius).

41 Abramowski 1963 [as note 32 - *ed.*], p. 183 with n. 81.

I shall now proceed to note, and to comment on, some points in Sahdona's chapter on the "sane faith". Quite in a Theodorian manner he speaks of the "future realities" (Sahdona II, 2, § 4). - Passing from the Trinity to christology (II, 2, § 19) he explains *oikonomia* as a "mystery of the most ineffable union of Jesus, *our God*". There are two other cases in the *Book of Perfection* where he calls *Christ* "our God".⁴² Sahdona is not the first and not the only one in his church to use this predication of Christ. [23] It is for instance very characteristic for the catholicos Timothy I.⁴³ - We are reminded of the Edessenians Narsai and Ḥabīb when Sahdona speaks of the abasement of the divine Son "through goodwill and love for the Father" (II, 2, § 20).

Already in the next paragraph (II, 2, § 21) we find the following statement: The God Logos uniting to himself in sublime fashion the nature of our humanity from the beginning of its formation and forever, has made it with himself *one hypostasis and prosopon* in a wonderful, ineffable union.

The same terms again in a purely Theodorian, Edessenian setting (II, 2, § 22): The God Logos put on a human body, "he joined the honor of his hypostasis to the visible", manifesting himself through it to the world "and therefore he is thought and spoken of (as) the one *prosopon and hypostasis* of the Son, the assuming one and the assumed."

In the next section (II, 2, § 23) there are the two *prosopa* which constitute the one *prosopon*. Sahdona speaks of the temple in which the assumer manifests his *prosopon* and then goes on to speak of the "*own prosopon*" of the *human* nature: its own *prosopon* is never seen by itself alone without the godhead. - Here we have a reflex of the "*own prosopon*" of Ps.-Nestorius in its first meaning (the second meaning below in § 30): each of the two natures in Christ has its own *prosopon*, whose unity is the one *prosopon*.⁴⁴

II 2, § 25: Each nature participates in the properties of the other so that "*this* one is called *that* one, *that* one is called *this* one, because of the union". Compare that with

⁴² II, 3, § 12 and in de Halleux 1975 [as note 11 - *ed.*], § 39, p. 286.

⁴³ The NT source for this predication is Tite 2, 13: The epiphany τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Then there is Romans 9, 5: ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὃ ὦν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός. The Peshitta places "over all" after "God", so the identification catches the eye even quicker than in the Greek. In Theodoret [Theodoret of Cyrus, *That even after the inhumanation our Lord Jesus Christ is one Son*, *Patrologia Graeca* 83, col. 1433-1440 - the *ed.*] we find in a little tractate from the year 448/9 a passage about the appellation "God" and "man" for the one Son, "each nature attracting its suitable appellation". For "man" he quotes I Timothy 2, 5 f., for "God" Tite 2, 13, for both names Romans 9, 5. PG 83, 1436B. English translation of the treatise in Pásztori-Kupán 2006 [I. Pásztori-Kupán, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, London, New York, 2006 - *ed.*], p. 188-192, of the relevant passage, p. 190. For another, pre-Ephesian passage on Romans 9, 5 in Theodoret see *ibid.*, p. 168 for PG 75 (Ps.-Cyril!), 1472B. - Certainly lists like this one were in use in the schools of Edessa and Nisibis.

⁴⁴ There is a whole chapter on the "*own prosopon* and the own εἰκὼν" in Abramowski 1963 [like Note 32 - the *ed.*], p. 186-193.

Ps. Nestorius: "One *prosopon* without doubt,⁴⁵ this one (is) that one and that one this one, while this one and that one remain".⁴⁶

[24] II, 2, § 28: The idea of "one *ousia* composite of two natures" is rejected by Sahdona, the correct way to speak is of the "*hypostatic prosopon* of the natures"; the same expression in § 29. These passages show that the *prosopon hypostatikon* from the last line of Ps.-Nestorius has been read by Sahdona as indicating the *one prosopon* of Christ.

In II, 2, § 30 we meet the concept, well known from the authentic part of the *Liber Heraclidis*, that the *prosopon* of one nature *makes use* of the *prosopon* of the other nature; and we also meet the term "his (or its) *own prosopon*" in the second of the possible two senses: "made own", "appropriated", which is of course the effect of the mutual use. This was a development of the concept by Ps.-Nestorius,⁴⁷ a more satisfying way to reach the union in Christ through the *prosopa* than Nestorius himself had achieved. - In the same sentence occurs the expression "natural *prosopon*" for the one *prosopon* of the one Christ: "Although each of them (sc. God and man) has the propriety of his nature, they are not two *prosopa*, but one *prosopon*, because each of them makes use of what is his companion's (*hbrh*); and it (the *prosopon*) is natural and not metaphorical (*š'yl'*), because of the inseparable union of the two natures".

To the confusion of the reader Sahdona then speaks in § 31 of the "natural *proso-pon*" as belonging to the nature (that is to say in the original correct manner) and not to the union of natures. De Halleux has noted the difference of meaning and tried to make sense of it; the true explanation through the dependence on the interpolated text of Ps.-Nestorius was not known to him, as I have said above.

In § 32 Sahdona evidently returns to the use of *prosopon* *physikon* for the one Son: "And therefore the *prosopon* is natural and one is the Son in two".

How shall we place Sahdona in the line of those people in the Church of the East who taught that the unity of Christ had to be expressed not only by one *prosopon* but by one hypostasis as well? Isho'yahb claims in his letter II, 7, written to Sahdona himself, that Isaiah of Taḥal "has written before you the same things in the same manner".⁴⁸ Here the future catholicos certainly refers to the polemical writings of Sahdona, lost to us. But even so it is doubtful whether Isho'yahb's assertion can be true literally. All we know of Isaiah is his partisanship of Ḥenana at Nisibis and that Ḥenanisho' the Monk and Babai the Great engaged in strong polemics against him, evidently because of the hypostasis *synthetos*. Well, we have [25] seen that Sahdona did not use that term, witness Isho'yahb himself. As far as we can judge in our present state of knowledge,

⁴⁵ Syr. *dl' pwlg*, translated by Nau 1910 [as note 38 - *the ed.*], p. 63, in its first, literal sense as "sans division".

⁴⁶ Bedjan 1910 [as note 37 - *ed.*], p. 96, 18 f.

⁴⁷ Lake n. 45.

⁴⁸ Duval 1904 [as note 7], p. 133, 10-12 textus; Duval 1905 [as note 7 - *ed.*], p. 100, 6-8 versio.

we may ascribe to Sahdona a considerable degree of originality for his selection of a literary and doctrinal source of incontestable authority, for of course the *Liber Heraclidis* as a whole was considered to be authentic. He must have read that work with the greatest attention to note those tiny Chalcedonian additions which some monk in Constantinople in sympathy with Antiochene theology and/or in memory of the former bishop wanted to add for the safety of the last Apology of Nestorius for himself; and, more interesting to us, Sahdona noted the difference between the introduction and the main work in the matter of christological terminology. But his leading interest, the assertion of *one* hypostasis in Christ, altered the original intention of the interpolations: they are now turned against Nestorius and those who taught like him. Thus in an indirect manner Sahdona's one hypostasis has an "old"-Chalcedonian origin and differs in this point from the neo-Chalcedonian hypostasis synthetos which is attributed to the school of Hēnana.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ I wish to thank Dr. Th. Hainthaler and Dr. M. Kellermann for their help in library matters; Dr. F. Thome had the great kindness to produce a PC copy of my ms. [The bibliography that follows in the original is included both in the notes of the article and in the general bibliography. Bibliography, in this volume pp. 499-508, has been incorporated - *ed.*]

3.6 The post-Ephesian Christology of the Edessen Theodorians¹

Narsai (ca. 415-502/3) is the representative of Edessenian-Theodoric Christology from whom we have the most extensive literary material. Initially he worked at the school of the Persians in Edessa, and finally for the last decades of his life at the school of Nisibis, which he co-founded. The treatise that Habib, who was educated in Edessa, wrote against Philoxenus in the early 80s of the 5th century is only preserved in quotations from Philoxenus;² however, these, together with Narsai's Christological homilies, make it possible to perceive this Christology as a specific form of Antiochene school theology. Bishop Barsauma of Nisibis, to whom we owe the founding of the school there, and the Persian Catholicos Acacius were also educated in Edessa. However, we only have brief synodal pronouncements from them in the *Synodicon Orientale*,³ which either express themselves in favor of Theodore or only hint at Theodorean formulations, but do not contain the Edessene specifics.

All of these theologians were active in the period after the Chalcedonian Council of 451, but this synod does not form a point of reference for them; rather, this function is performed by the monophysite form of Cyrillic Christology, as it was aggressively represented by Philoxenus in particular in the Syriac language area. Both Philoxenus and the much more reserved Cyrillian Jacob of Sarug also studied in Edessa, where they switched from the Antiochian camp to that of Cyril's followers.

Habib stated the principle that the nomenclature of *theologia* and *oikonomia* is not identical. Narsai also follows this principle. [2] This has the effect that *prosopon*,⁴ *parsopa*, is used by him only christologically, i.e. for the one person of Christ, in whom divine and human nature are united;

¹ The present text is an attempt to provide a brief summary of the second part of a chapter of the same name, "From Edessa to Nisibis"; the first part of the chapter analyzes Christological homilies by this theologian under the title "Narsai". The entire chapter is ready for printing and is available for the

The first volume on the Oriental churches in the work *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, founded by Alois Grillmeier and continued by Theresia Hainthaler, [not yet published - ed.]

² On this, see my study "Aus dem Streit um das 'Unus ex trinitate passus est': Der Protest des Habib gegen die Epistula dogmatica des Philoxenus an die Mönche", in: *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, II,3: *Die Kirchen von Jerusalem und Antiochien nach 451 bis 600*, Theresia Hainthaler, ed., Freiburg im Breisgau u. a. 2002, 570-647.

³ Barsauma (cited in 605): *Synodicon Orientale ou Receuil des synodes nestoriens*, Publ., trad., et annoté par J[ean]-B[aptiste] Chabot, Paris 1902 (NEMBN, 37), 211. 475; Acacius: ibid. 54 f. 302.

⁴ In the following I use the Greek word for the Syriac equivalent, which in this case is a loan word anyway.

qnoma (which corresponds to *hypostasis*⁵), on the other hand, is reserved for the Logos as the divine Trinitarian hypostasis. These restrictions cannot be derived from Theodore of Mopsuestia. They must have originated in the fierce disputes between followers of Theodore and Cyril in Edessa. I even suspect that it was a collective decision by the Theodorian-minded part of the school's teaching staff, which did not only have to do with the proclamations and provocations of Philoxenus, but was already made after 431, i.e. decades earlier.

The provocation was not only that of Philoxenus, but already that of Cyril with his introduction of the one hypostasis in its pseudo-Athanasian form, i.e. apollinaristic, determination in Christology.

While Nestorius responded to a suggestion by Cyril and still spoke of the "double hypostases of the natures" in Christ in a sermon in Constantinople, the purely Christological documents of the peace treaty between Antioch and Alexandria of 433 completely abstain from the concept of hypostasis on both sides, if only because they omit the problem of Cyril's anathema, which was unacceptable to the Antiochians. The fact that the decision to be postulated in the hypostasis question with regard to Christology is consistent with the language of the documents of 433 and takes no notice of Nestorius' statements can initially be explained by the post-Ephesian situation; but if one can read from Narsai's Homily XI⁶ what its author *does not* know about Nestorius, then one must also assume that the relevant texts of Nestorius were not known in Edessa.⁷ And it is no coincidence that the above-mentioned sermon with its mention of Nestorius only dates from Narsai's Nisibene period.

Compared to the rigid language of the Edessen Theodorians, the terminology of their master Theodore appears very flexible both in the doctrine of the Trinity and in Christology, especially when one compares the *ecthesis* denounced by the presbyter Charisi[3]us in *Ephesus*⁸ with the well-known Christological pieces from *De incarnatione* and *Contra Eunomium*. However, Theodore was not in a situation comparable to that created by the Cyrillic anathemas and the condemnation of Nestorius.

⁵ Hereafter often used for the Syriac equivalent *qnoma*.

⁶ Cf. Luise Abramowski, "Narsai, Homily XI", *The harp* 20 (2006) = Fs. Jakob Thekeparampil, 333-348.

⁷ We know from Edessene records read out at the Ephesian Synod of 449 that "writings" by Nestorius were found with Ibas and his deacon Maron (*Acts of the Ephesian Synod of 449, Syriac. Ed. by Johannes Flemming. With Georg Hoffmann's German transl. and his notes*, Berlin 1917, repr. Göttingen 1970 [AAWG. PH, N. F. 15, 1], 18 f. 26 f. 44 f.) - if only we also knew which writings. Those writings were undoubtedly destroyed by the Edessene enemies of Ibas after they were found.

⁸ Text ACO I 1, 7 97-99; also Luise Abramowski, "Die Sitzung des Konzils von Ephesus am 22. Juli 431 'Über die Befestigung des Symbols der heiligen Väter in Nicäa und über den von Presbyter Charisius übergebenen Libellus'", ZKG 115 (2004), 382-390 [here in this volume pp. 405-413].

The basic Antiochian formula of Christology is known to be: two natures, one *prosopon*. It applies to the Edessenians as well as to the church of the Persian Empire. In Narsai, however, the one *prosopon* is much rarer than one might expect in view of the multiple emphasis on unity in Christ. Often it can only be inferred from the defense against the accusation that he teaches two *prosopa* and two sons. For example, he says that the listeners of his sermon should not think that he is talking about two *prosopa*, "who keep their distance from one another", when he speaks of Christ as man. The unity of the *prosopon* is the unity of the *Son*. Moreover, the dyophysite constitution of Christ is preserved in the Risen One and in the One returning to judgment; the human nature in him, though glorified, is no more mixed or transformed than the Logos.

But "the Son of God is a *prosopon not by nature*" because of the total difference between the two natures, "because God is God and man is man". This difference can only be overcome by the Godhead. The rejection of the unity "by nature" implies the protest against Cyril's ἔνωσις φυσική from the third anathematism against Nestorius. For Narsai, the unity of the Christological *prosopon* is a mystery and therefore an object of faith - i.e. that the usual categories are not applicable to this case.

The distinction between the two natures (to avoid their σύγχυσις, syr. *bulbala*) was already taught by Christ and his disciples; thus it is given with Christianity itself and is therefore just as old as this. Narsai describes the difference between the two natures as that of an "order". It is the Logos who overcomes the unhealthy distance between the "orders": out of love he calls his body the "Son of God in his own rank", i.e. the divine rank; he gives it this rank without forfeiting any of its divinity. The unity of the *prosopon* is the result of the activity of the Logos. To put it another way: the unity of the *prosopon* comes about through the divine essence, and not through its nature, but through love. It is the love of God, i.e. a personal relationship that forms one person from the Creator and the creature; however, it differs from all other personal relationships in that it is indissoluble and even death cannot harm it.

[4] The debate with the Cyrillians revolves around the theologically correct use of the Logos. The Logos as a *Trinitarian* hypostasis is completely determined by its divine nature; it is without beginning, infinite, boundless and therefore cannot be limited. "Physical", "physical" statements cannot be made about it, neither "becoming" nor local change are appropriate to the divine nature of the second hypostasis. It is the opponents who say: The Logos *became in his hypostasis* (sc. flesh), or: *His hypostasis* was flesh. This is explicitly rejected: "The Logos *did not* become flesh in *his hypostasis*". On the other hand, the statement is correct: The Logos bore the human being. A characteristic rendering of John 1:1 is: "In the beginning was the Logos, and he was with God, and the Logos was God *in hypostasis and power*": when the opponents say that the *hypostasis* is

If the Logos became flesh, then the Logos could not have borne the flesh of Mary, which would have negative soteriological consequences. *Becoming* flesh "is far removed" from the beginningless divine essence. - Thus we find that the term *qnoma* is only used by Narsai for the Logos in contexts of salvation history when he quotes and rejects the opponents.

For the "*oikonomia*"⁹ and thus for Christology, Narsai differentiates between the divine nature of the Logos and his activities (we have already seen this above in the question of the unity of the person of Christ). Narsai demonstrates the differentiation, for example, in the interpretation of biblical statements about the descent and ascent of God; Habib also does this. It is the problem of the change of location of the omnipresent - the "fools" do not understand this correctly. The departure of the Son from the Father is not distance from the Father, rather "his *will* came into the world". The Son *came*, but "he came wholly *in his will*". "His nature is everywhere, but his will goes and comes".

What Narsai ascribes to the will of the Logos when speaking precisely, he can simply say of the Logos in other places, which is even the more frequent case. Will and love are not only the mode of divine activity, they also precede it as a motive. Of the Son, who is hidden in the Father, it is said: "And because of his love for us he bore the perfect man and made him one with himself in dominion and power". The incarnation of John 1:14 is to be understood in this way (note the active role of the Logos here too): "*He formed the flesh* and dwelt in it by his will". "His will dwelt in our nature, and *His* nature remained hidden in it". In contrast to the divine nature, the will can be limited (otherwise the indwelling would be inconceivable): "While the Logos limited his will in (assumed man), he did not limit his nature in him". I.e. the divine will of the divine Logos is not limited by anything extra-divine, but it is a self-limitation of the Logos for the [5] indwelling in the body. The Only Begotten is the creator of the temple, i.e. the body; he wanted to dwell in this work of his.

The "love", "will" and "power" of the Logos are interchangeable in their effect on the human nature of Christ. We can speak of the self-abasement of the Logos if we attribute it to his will and not to his divine nature.

One of the main themes of Narsai's Christological homilies is the revelation of the invisible in the visible. The visible is our access to the invisible, the revealed to the hidden; not only here on earth, now, but also there in the hereafter. Thus "the Creator revealed to the whole cosmos in a crucified man the name of his divine essence and the great power of his divinity". Revelation through the means of the visible is necessary on the side of the divine

⁹ The transcription of the Greek vocabulary for the Syriac equivalent *mdabranutha*.

for the realization of the salvific intentions because of the divine transcendence and on the side of the addressees because of their natural limitations and inability.

The divine Son could not be seen in his *nature* by mortals; he "wore a man" in order to conceal "his splendor". This still applies to the return of Christ: "The revelation of his body is seen by the heavenly and the earthly (while his divinity is hidden) through the curtain of humanity". It is only possible to *see* the Returning One at all through the (now glorified) body: "Mortals behold him openly, face to face".

Seeing the visible gives us comfort, since we cannot see the hypostasis of the Logos. Of course, after the Ascension we are deprived of the direct sight of the glorified Jesus, but "in a certain way we see him here", i.e. now, "in mysteries and riddles", but there "with an open face we see him himself, but not the hypostasis of the Logos", because that is impossible.

In the Johannine version of the baptism story (John 1:32), however, it says: "I *saw* the Spirit descending as a dove ...". This is explained in such a way that the Baptist was "honored by a revelation" for this vision. Here, the homiletus is faced with the necessity of balancing the statement of the Gospel text with the principle of the invisibility of the divine. His paraphrase of John 1:32 f. then looks like this: "I saw the Spirit, *a hidden nature*, descending in the mystery of the bird (and) remaining hidden in the revelation of perfect love".

The unity of Logos and body is neither dissolved in the grave nor in the Ascension: in the Ascension, *the hidden is lifted up in the revealed*, the God in the body. In four of Narsai's homilies (LXXIX. IV. XXXVI. XLV) there are statements that do not want to accept the invisibility of the divine and our dependence on the visible (even in the hereafter). They claim a view into the depths of the invisible, the divine, for the "re[6]gions of the soul". These statements are literarily recognizable as interpolations of the same hand; they articulate a spiritual dissatisfaction with the principle advocated by Narsai. In Homily XLV, this is joined by another voice that accepts the dependence on the visible only after a difficult struggle for access to the divine essence. The Logos has accepted "one of us", through unity with him he has an effect on him and thus also on us. What the Cyrillians say about the incarnate Logos amounts to subjecting God to the "contemptible", i.e. everything that belongs to human nature; on the other hand, they deny our nature the honor of the one who has assumed it. The Son, in fact, makes *us* great by "putting on our contemptible nature and taking it up with him into heaven for glory", to the seat at the right hand of God. Man "partook of the glorious (things) because of the love of him who received him". "Our conspecific" has come to "perfection" "in unity with the Logos". The honoring of the mortal by the "glories of the only-begotten" did not only take place then, it applies to all time.

Eternity, "so that there is no end to his power" - we recognize here the consequence of the continued existence of Christ's human nature even after the ascension.

In order to show his power in the assumed human being, the Logos has produced him as a rational image of himself; thus the human being that the Logos creates for himself in Mary is characterized as a second Adam - also *imago Dei*, but not corrupt. The "mediator from our generation" is the image of the glory of the Logos. The effect of the acceptor on the accepted is shown in the overcoming of death.

Incidentally, by the very manner of his conception and birth, the man born is holier and more glorious than the other "corporeals", even more exalted than his mother. This is an expression of piety for Christ, based on the birth stories of the New Testament; there is no balancing out with talk of the contemptibility of human nature.

The renewal of man takes place in the second Adam. In body and soul, the second Adam is equal to the first, but "in authority he is Lord of Adam and his descendants", he has become greater in honor than all. "It is the flesh that was exalted and received power through the divine essence", but this was of course not dependent on the power of the "contemptible flesh". The ascension is the miracle of the exaltation of contemptible human nature.

"I have marveled greatly at how much our clay has been magnified in its contemptibility, which, though dust, has acquired authority and has begun to rule over everything". The "contemptibility" of our nature is derived from the matter used by the Creator in creation. This nature is made of clay, of dust, "earthen" in the original meaning of the word: of earth (Gen 2). In the biblical [7] text, no qualifying adjective is attached to "dust of the earth" (the same vocabulary in Hebrew and Syriac). But the negative connotation is easy to obtain from the Old Testament, at least it is self-evident to Narsai, Habib also knows it. The utilization of the motif establishes the commonality of human nature, ours and Christ's, since the beginning of creation. However, the lowly origin of human nature from the contemptible material that the Creator used for it also represents the greatest possible contrast to the "elevation" to "honor" to the "glories" that are bestowed on this nature through its union with the Logos in Christ. We, who have human nature in common with Christ, also share the honor: "Our dust is exalted through the honor with the Son of our race". Thus, from the two creation stories in Genesis 1 and 2, two different aspects of Christ's human nature have been extracted with regard to our salvation.

The Edessenian-Theodorian schooling also had an after-effect on the Cyrillian Jacob of Sarug (ca. 451-521). Jacob himself reports that he turned from the Theodoric to the Cyrillian faction at the school when the writings of Diodorus were translated there. The traces of his original

I only became aware of the differences in his theology and formation when I read Tanios Bou Mansour's¹⁰ presentation of his Christology and theology a second time, after I had worked my way through Habib and Narsai. The debates about the questions of authenticity, led by Paul Peeters and Paul Krüger, have been brought to an end by the excellent work of Taeke Jansma.¹¹ Bou Mansour describes the distinction between nature and *oikonomia* in statements about the Son of God as a basic axiom of Jacob's Christology; in his presentation in volume II, 3 of *Jesus the Christ*, Bou Mansour uses the basic axiom as a structuring principle. He wants to derive it from Alexandrian Christology. In fact, however, it is the same distinction that both Habib and Narsai work with. It is therefore a matter of common school heritage; the difference lies in how they deal with it.

Jacob emphasizes the immutability of the divine nature so strongly that Krüger and Roberta C. Chesnut¹² see the danger of docetism looming. The deity is overvalued, logically resulting in the impossibility of a unification of the Logos with human nature. This means that Jacob adopted the school's doctrine of nature in a one-sided way and renounced or avoided the depiction of [8] human nature, at least in the form taught by the school. And in accordance with his new conviction, he attributes the suffering of Christ to the divine hypostasis, *qnoma*. From Bou Mansour's lectures, one could conclude that *qnoma* in the sense of hypostasis is relatively common in Jacob; but in many cases the word is used in its abbreviated meaning as a reflexive or identity pronoun, so that it is more correct to translate it as "self", which incidentally does not in the least weaken the theological weight of the statements in question. Bou Mansour sees the Christological question in Jacob "integrated into the Trinitarian dimension" as in Ephrem. But this does not require recourse to Ephrem, because the phenomenon arises from the dispute between the two schools of thought on the problem of how the human nature of Christ, united with the Logos, is to be seen in its relationship to the Trinity.

Jacob's school heritage also includes the Adams typology and the counter-typology.

hidden" - "obviously", of course in a slightly shifted use.

The criticized overemphasis on the divine nature in Christ (see above) is contradicted by the fact that Jacob, unlike Cyril, avoids referring to the human nature of Christ as *nature*. The question is whether this is merely a renunciation of the term,

¹⁰ Tanios Bou Mansour, "Die Christologie des Jacob von Sarug", in: *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, II, 3: *Die Kirchen von Jerusalem und Antiochien nach 451 bis 600*, Theresia Hainthaler, ed., Freiburg im Breisgau u. a. 2002, 449-499. Supplementary to this is ders., *La théologie de Jacques de Saroug*,

II: *Christologie, trinité, eschatologie, méthode exégétique et théologique*, Kaslik 2000 (Bibliothèque de l'Université Saint-Esprit, Kaslik, Liban, 40).

¹¹ Paper on the discussion in Bou Mansour, "Christology" (note 10).

¹² As in note 10.

or a renunciation in the matter. Jacob presumably chose this simple linguistic device to avoid the accusation that he was teaching two natures.

There is a passage on the immutability of the nature of the Logos in the Incarnation in which Jacob's theological origin *and* the polemical rejection of it are expressed in an exemplary manner: "The Logos was not transformed, but remained in his divine nature, in the end he descended *hypostatically* and *willingly through love* ... He was God and *became* man". Descent of the Logos through love and will - this was also taught by the Theodorians, but what they rejected, because it did not correspond to the divine nature of the Logos, was the descent of the *hypostasis* Logos; they would therefore not have said "hypostatically and willingly", but "*economically* and willingly".

Jacob distinguishes New Testament texts that belong to the "bodily order" from others that concern both humanity and the divinity of the Son. Astonishingly, these include the prayers that Jesus addresses to the Father: Jesus asks the Father, while knowing that he is with the Father, to answer every request. He prays because he became man, and he answers because he is the Son from eternity. - Prayer and answering therefore take place in the one Christ; this is a distinction that is inconceivable without the example of Theodore, which was conveyed by the school.¹³

[9] A surprising late echo of the way in which the Edessen Theodorians dealt with the problem of *hypostasis* in Christology can be found in the lemma to the letter that the Catholicos George I addressed to the priest Mina in 680. The lemma comes from the collector of the *Synodicon Orientale* and is therefore even later than the letter. The lemma states that the letter teaches "about the divinity of Christ and his humanity, and that *not* ... the *God Logos* was transformed and *became man in his hypostasis*".¹⁴ This formulation, which could have been taken directly from Narsai or Habib, does not appear in George's entire letter; the Catholicos represents, as is correct after 612, a Christology of two natures, two hypostases and one *prosopon*. The collector of the *Synodicon Orientale* is evidently still familiar with the literature of the Edessenian-Theodorian phase of Antiochian theology, above all with Narsai.

¹³ See Luise Abramowski, "Die liturgische Homilie des Ps. Narses mit dem Massbekenntnis und einem Theodor-Zitat", *BJRL* 78 (1996), 87-100 [here in this volume pp. 153-165]; this, "Narsai, Ephräm und Kyrill [9] über Jesu Verlassenheitsruf, Matth. 27,46", in: *Crossroad of cultures. Studies in liturgy and*

patristics in honor of Gabriele Winkler, Hans-Jürgen Feulner, Elena Velkovska and Robert F. Taft, eds, Roma 2000 (OCA, 260), 43-67 [here in this volume pp. 175-194]. For "Ephräm" in this title would now be "pseudo-ephemera" (this is the Diatesseron commentary).

¹⁴ *Synodicon Orientale* (note 3), 227.490.

3.7 The Bishop of Seleukia-Ktesiphon as Catholicos and Patriarch of the Church of the East

1 "General bishop" - episkopos katholikos

In a *more suo* refreshingly sharply formulated contribution from 1967 (resumed in 1970) on the introduction of the title "patriarch" for the bishop of Seleukia-Ktesiphon, J.-M. Fiey necessarily also touches on the title "catholicos" for the holder of this throne.¹ For Fiey's initial question is why this prelate bears the dual title "catholicos-patriarch" and what the relationship between the two titles is. "Dès l'abord nous sommes handicapés par l'absence d'une étude d'ensemble sur la nature exacte du catholicat. Although the etymology of the word *catholicos* is clear, the origins of its use in the ecclesiastical language, *with the change of sense that it underwent as it passed through the civil language*², have not yet, as I say, been studied systematically"³. It is not known when the term "catholicos" was formed. The Persian martyr records only speak of the bishop of Seleucia-Ktesiphon and the church historian Sozomenos (who knows Persian martyr records) of the archbishop⁴; the church history of [2] Sozomenos, incidentally, goes back to the year 439, and in the Synod of 410, "archbishop" and "katholikos" are among the titles of Isaac of Seleucia-Ktesiphon.⁵

Note: For technical, lexicographical, librarian and bibliographical help I thank the doctores, private lecturers, professors, S. Gerö, Theresia Hainthaler, Mechthild Kellermann, W. Löhr, Karin Metzler, A. Schilling. The PC transcript is thanks to the always helpful colleague Hainthaler.

1 J.-M. FIEY, Les étapes de la prise de conscience de son identité patriarcale par l'église syrienne orientale, L'Orient Syrien 12, 1967, 3-22. Reprinted with a few linguistic changes and some additions as Chap. III under the title "Catholicat et patriarcat" in DERS, Jalons pour une histoire de l'église en Iraq, CSCO 310, Subs. 36, 1970, 66-84, hereafter cited according to the "Jalons". Preceded by: W. DE VRIES, Antiochien und Seleucia-Ktesiphon, Patriarch und Katholikos?, in: Mélanges E. Tisserant III, StT 233, 1964, 429-450.

2 My emphasis. Evidence for the civil use of the substantive adjective καθολικός in non-ecclesiastical sources in Liddell-Scott s.v., in ecclesiastical sources in PGL. Liddell-Scott describes the title as "supervisor of accounts (οἱ καθόλου λόγοι), = Lat. procurator a rationibus".

3 FIEY, Jalons (see note 1), 66 f.

4 FIEY, Jalons (see note 1), 83.

5 Synodicon Orientale ou Recueil des synodes nestoriens publié, traduit et annoté par J. B. CHABOT d'après le ms. Syriaque 332 de la Bibliothèque Nationale et le ms. K. VI, 4 du Musée Borgia à Rome, NEMBN 37, Paris 1902, 18,11 [Syriac text]/254 [French translation; in the text = Synodicon Orientale]: "Head of the bishops".

The acts of this synod of 410, the first⁶ that have come down to us from the Church of the East, use the title *Katholikos* "without further ado" ("d'emblée"). Fiey does consider whether the title could have been inserted into the records at a later date (like the title "patriarch" in the records of the Synod of 424, see below.⁷). In my opinion, however, the obviousness with which the term appears speaks against this; it must have been familiar to the participants of the synod beforehand. But for how long? I think we can arrive at a plausible assumption. Labourt's synchronic table gives the years 346-383: "Vacance" on the patriarchal side⁸; this sedisvacance falls in the second half of the reign of the Great King Shapur II (reign 309-379) and in the first years of his succession. This was a long period of persecution of Christians, the evidence of which can be found in the Acts of Martyrdom. The Persian-Roman peace treaties under Shapur II (with Theodosius I) and Bahram IV (negotiated with Stilicho) had to bring relief to the Christians⁹. "Au reste, l'histoire de cette époque est pour nous fort obscure. If we are able to conclude with a certain degree of certainty that the ecclesias of Perse are progressively improving their condition, we do not know precisely what this improvement consisted of. The persecution was certainly suspended; but the reorganization of the hierarchy must still be subject to a lot of entrails." ¹⁰ "One fact is very little certain. Les Actes du concile de Séleucie tenu en 410 supposent la plupart des sièges épiscopaux pourvus de titulaires. Quelques-uns même étaient [3] disputés par plusieurs compétiteurs. Il semble donc que la paix regnât depuis un assez grand nombre d'années, puisque les chrétientés persanes avaient pu, dans une large mesure, réparer les désastres que leur avait causés la longue persécution de Sapor" ¹¹. If now the martyr acts of the persecution under Shapur II. do not yet recognize the title *katholikos* for the bishop of the capital, but the records of the assembly of 410 use it, then its use must have arisen in the meantime; apparently the time span was long enough for this too.

⁶ The second lemma on the Synod of 410 (CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 17/253) speaks of "the assembly of the bishops that took place for the *first time* in the land of the Persians" - but there had already been at least one synod about 100 years earlier under Papa; the report on it plays a major role in the

On the confession, procedure and canons of the synod, see also P. Bruns, *Bemerkungen zur Rezeption des Nicaenums in der ostsyrischen Kirche*, AHC 32, 2000, 1-22. Bruns anachronistically refers to the bishop of Antioch at the time as "Patriarch", op. cit., 16 On the "fact that Persia was dependent on Antioch for jurisdiction until the 5th century" (op. cit., 1 note 2), see the corrections to this view below.

⁷ FIEY, *Jalons* (see note 1), 83. The second lemma is secondary.

⁸ J. LABOURT, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide (224-632)*, Paris 1904, 353.

⁹ LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 84.

¹⁰ LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 85.

¹¹ LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 86.

At this point, Fiey's *problem of how to imagine the transition from katholikos as a secular accountant or tax official to a senior bishop with this title* must be declared *wrong*. The starting point for the ecclesiastical title in the form of a substantive adjective is not the secular title, but the adjective *katholikos* in *episkopos*, both Greek words taken as Aramaicized loanwords¹², because until proven otherwise, it can be assumed that this form of the title in the meaning "general bishop" was formed within the East Syriac church for the bishop of the capital and was not applied to him from outside¹³. This title contains a claim that goes beyond that of honorary primacy: the holder of the title describes himself as a bishop who presides over the entire church "of the East and the neighboring areas". It can be assumed that it was the holder of the throne himself who coined the title - i.e. Isaac¹⁴ (and not one of his two elusive predecessors¹⁵). The state of the church after the persecution could thus offer Bishop Isaac the opportunity to express his claim through the new title.

[4] The full title is *episkopos katholikos*¹⁶, *katholikos* is the *short form* for this cumbersome title; the short or absolute form is then in fact again a substantival adjective as in the case of those Greek officials. In the *Synodicon Orientale*, the frequent occurrence of the full title is obscured by Chabot's translation practice: he always places a comma between the two words when they stand next to each other, so that they also appear to stand next to each other as two nouns in the Syriac original. However, Chabot's punctuation not only indicates his understanding, but also the non-analogous translation of the two components: "évêque, catholicos"¹⁷. The suggestive power of this habit

12 In non-vocalized transcription 'psqwp' qtwlyq'.

13 And why did they use a Greek word as an adjective and not a possible Syriac one?

14 LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 85 note 4, second section, to be read on p. 86, ver-refers to the Synod of Dadišo' 424, where it is said of the Catholicos Isaac, "par les mains duquel fut restitué, après avoir vaqué pendant 22 ans, le principat (*ršnwt'*) du suprême sacerdoce sur le peuple chrétien, et qui exalta l'Église, par la reconstitution du principat, grâce à la grande faveur que Dieu lui avait donnée près du roi" (CHABOT, *Synodicon* (as note. 5), 48,30-33/292 f.). Although this statement is found in a questionable part of the Acts of 424 (in the speech of Bishop Agapet, see below), it remains historically probable, especially since the Acts of the Synod of Isaac of 410 were available. If in the same speech Bishop Papa is referred to as *Katholikos* (CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 46.18/289 f.), this is a backward projection.

15 On the problem of the existence of these persons, see LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 85 with the annotations and FIEY, *Jalons* (see note 1), 64.

16 In the following, for reasons of easier writing and reading, I have retained the transcription of the underlying Greek words in Latin letters and have omitted the transcription of the Syriac loanwords.

17 The correct rendering would be "évêque général", "general bishop"; the translation "Catholic bishop" is forbidden in all languages because of its connotation in today's usage.

is so strong that even a critical mind like Fiey's considers the abbreviated form of the title to be the original.

The full title remained in use alongside the short title¹⁸. So we have the complete title in Kosmas Indikopleustes, concerning the person of Mar Aba: (Πατρίκιος = Aba) ... ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς νυνὶ ἐκ θείας χάριτος ἐπὶ τοὺς ὑψηλοὺς καὶ ἀρχιερατικοὺς θρόνους ἀνήχθη τῆς ὅλης Περσίδος, καθολικὸς ἐπίσκοπος τῶν αὐθότι κατασταθεὶς¹⁹. This information is written after 540, the year of Mar Aba's election to office. It alludes with ἀρχιερατικούς to the title "archbishop", which the prelates of the Persian royal city also used to bear²⁰ (as already stated in the Procoll of the Synod of 410), and correctly refers καθολικός to the "whole of Persia". Kosmas is thus a witness to the older designation of the supreme bishop of the church in Persia in its complete form, while Mar Aba himself adds another title^[5], that of patriarch. Apparently it took some time before this could also be recognized from the outside, in this case by Kosmas Indikopleustes in Alexandria; the same phenomenon occurred in the century before with the church historian Sozomenos, who was not yet familiar with the title *Katholikos* for the bishop of Seleukia-Ktesiphon some time after its introduction (see above)²¹.

One form of the title heaping for the supreme bishop in the protocol of 410 reads (I translate Chabot's translation and reproduce his punctuation):

"Isaac, bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, *katholikos*, archbishop of the whole East" (thus three times - once again without the "whole East"²²). In my opinion, "*katholikos*" is also an *adjective* to *episkopos* in this title form, the genitive of place is inserted in order to nip any idea in the bud that the bishop of another important place could be the *episkopos katholikos*; the completely unsemitic word order, which betrays the Greek influence on Syriac syntax, emphasizes this even further: the

18 I give as examples only the signatures under the synodal minutes: 410 Isaac, "episkopos katholikos" (CHABOT, *Synodicon* (as note 5), 35/274); 420 Yahbalaha "episkopos katholikos" (op. cit., 42/283); 424 Dadišo: the signatures are mentioned (op. cit., 52/297), but not listed (the minutes of this synod are full of problems anyway, to which a separate section must be devoted below); 486 Acacius "episkopos katholikos" (op. cit., 59/306); 497 (Šila for) Babai "episkopos katholikos" (op. cit., 65/315); with Mar Aba 544, the self-designation "patriarch" begins alongside the short title "katholikos"; on the signatures of the various documents adopted by Mar Aba, see below; surprisingly, Joseph, who was not lacking in self-confidence, still signs "episkopos katholikos" in 554 (op. cit., 108/366), his successors sign with "Katholikos, Patriarch" or only with "Patriarch".

19 Kosmas Ind., *Christian Topography* II 2 (SC 141, 307 Wolska-Conus).

20 In obvious alignment with the usage that developed in the 4th century for upper bishops in the Roman Empire.

21 Presumably, these titles were initially used within the church before they became publicly known.

22 CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 18,10-12/254; 19,1 f./256; 19,20 f./257; 20,31 f./259.

"Cities" ²³ are literally bracketed by the bishop's title. The meaning of the formulation would be: "Isaac of Seleukia-Ktesiphon, *episkopos katholikos* <...>" ²⁴.

Even in the document of 410, "katholikos" can already occur absolutely, as a noun. In Mar Aba 544 we then have the abstract *qtwlykwt* ²⁵ as a derivation from the title and, particularly interesting, the aramaized adjective in feminine form in the meaning "by the katholikos": the *mdbrnwt' qtwlyqyt'* of the church, "the catholic church regiment" = "the church regiment of the katholikos" or "by the katholikos" as the overall bishop ²⁶.

Two phenomena of the use of titles in the protocol of 410 have not yet been recognized in their significance for the relationship of the church in the Persian Empire to the church in the Roman diocese of Oriens with Antioch as its capital.

First. The fourth section of the synodal text (according to Chabot's outline in his translation, which corresponds exactly to the content, 255 below) [6] lists the bishops who provided their colleague Maruta of Maipherkat with the letter that he was to read out before the Great King. The bishops of Antioch, Aleppo, Edessa, Tella and Amida are mentioned by name. The title of the bishop of Antioch ²⁷ is not simply "bishop", but *episkopos katholikos* (written "évêque, catholicos" by Chabot in his misleading rendering). *This means that the position or rank of the bishop of Antioch is equated with that of the bishop of the Persian capital (as well as vice versa);* although the title is Greek, as already mentioned, it is common in the Syriac-speaking church of Persia and is obviously applied to the Antiochian by the author of the protocol *there*.

Secondly. Fiey ²⁸ lists the titles given to the head of the church of the Persian Empire in 410 and 420 (and to which "patriarch" *does not* belong ²⁹), among them "*Great Metropolitan*". It should be corrected here that this title (partially translated in its mixed form: *mtrwpwlytys rb'*) is *only* used in 410, where

²³ This is how the double city Seleukia-Ktesiphon is often referred to in the sources (hence the plural ὁπόνοι in the quotation from Kosmas above).

²⁴ In Canons VI and XII, glosses emphasize the primacy's connection to the Church of Kōkē registered, see below.

²⁵ In CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 69.1/318, inadvertently translated as "patriarcat". We should therefore read: "la dualité du *catholicat* introduite par <...>."

²⁶ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 68.23 f. and 69.2/318 f.: "le gouvernement catholique du patriarcat"; loc. cit., 69.11 f./319: "unité du gouvernement catholique".

²⁷ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 255 note 3 on Porphyrius of Antioch: "Porphyrios homme de mœurs depravées, partisan de Theophile d'Alexandrie et ennemi de saint Jean Chrysostome, qui se fit donner subrepticement l'ordination episcopale à la mort de Flavien (403) et occupa le siège jusqu'en 413".

²⁸ FIEY, Jalons (see note 1), 78.

²⁹ The (second) lemma CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 253 f. is not to be used, it is younger than the Text of the minutes.

only in the canons, and in no other synod. These are canons 1 (263)³⁰, 6 (264), 18 (270 twice), 19 (271), 21 (272 twice, 273 twice).

What the canons of 410 describe is a church with a three-tiered episcopal hierarchy: bishop, metropolitan³¹, grand-metropolitan/catholicos; in the words of Labort³²: "<...> une hiérarchie méthodiquement organisée appliquait par tout l'empire des règles uniformes que l'expérience presque séculaire des chrétiens du monde romain avait consacrées et, pour ainsi dire, canonisées". It cannot be assumed that the provincial organization as such was something new for the church of the Persian Empire; here, however, the horizontal relationships (district boundaries!) and the vertical relationships are precisely defined. There is no doubt that the influence of Maruta is decisive here. While the title *episkopos katholikos* or *katholikos* expresses a *claim* of the chief bishop [7], the title Great Metropolitan is systemically related to the existing type of ecclesiastical organization. One could say that the "general bishop" realizes his claim to leadership in this huge church territory in his *function* as chief metropolitan.

In none of the Roman imperial dioceses was the three-tiered episcopal system so clearly developed as in the Diocese *Oriens*, and this was the best known of the Persian Church in terms of natural conditions. One can assume that the title Grand Metropolitan was introduced by Maruta into the canonical provisions of the Synod of 410; was it perhaps in use in the Church of the Diocese *Oriens* for the Bishop of Antioch? Unfortunately, the GPL offers no evidence; it would be very satisfying if such evidence were to emerge from the literature of the period between 381 and 451. In any case, the title did not become established in the Church of the East. From Maruta's point of view, the Bishop of Antioch naturally had the position of a supreme or major metropolitan in relation to his large church territory. If it is thanks to Maruta, as I assume, that this systemic title is applied to the *katholikos* of Seleukia-Ktesiphon, then he too, a bishop "from the territory of the Romans", sees the holder of this throne as a senior bishop with the rank of senior bishop of Antioch; he thus shares the view of the recorder, who calls the Antiochian bishop *episkopos katholikos* of Antioch (see above). Expressed in modern (Catholic) ecclesiological terminology, *the relationship between the two prelates is one of collegiality, seen from both sides*. There is no canonical dependence of the Church of the East on that of the Imperial Diocese of the East in the sense of subordination or even subordination.

³⁰ Labort's "Table analytique de matières" on the Synodicon Orientale (see note 5), 689a, gives at "Metropolitain (Grand)" only this place.

³¹ In the canons of 410, the bishop of Seleukia-Ktesiphon can also be called "metropolitan". I cannot decide whether *rb'* ("great") was always used in these cases. Also, strictly speaking the bishop is the metropolitan of his ecclesiastical province.

³² LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 98.

However, this does not exclude Western sympathy for the fate of the Christians in the Persian Empire and concrete help. Thus the synodal text expresses gratitude for the "remembrance of the love for us" and "the concern of the perception concerning us" ³³, which had prompted the special ecclesiastical commissioning of Bishop Maruta (who had come to Persia as a member of an imperial legation) and his provision of a letter to the [8] Great King. The two hendiadyoin are certainly chosen with the greatest care for expression.

2 Patriarch

"The ³⁴ words 'patriarch' and 'patriarchate' are Greek words. If the specialists are to be believed, then these words only appear in the modern sense in Greek texts after Chalcedon (451). We cannot therefore expect to find them in non-Greek texts, such as Syriac texts, before this date. If they are found, this proves without any doubt that these texts were subsequently edited in order to "insert" the termini defined since then. Finding such edits in the Synodicon Orientale should not come as a surprise in a collection that was only compiled after the creation of the most recently preserved components (end of the 8th century). Anachronisms have long been noted, especially for the Synod of 424. "Pour le point qui nous occupe, nous devons être intraitables et biffer le mot 'patriarche' dans les textes du Synodicon partout où nous le trouverons employé au sens propre avant 451." ³⁵

I gladly join the "intransigence" in this matter, the mere "Crossing out" is, of course, too simplistic, and in fact Fiey proceeds in a more differentiated way when going through the texts in question - but not differentiated enough as far as the case of Barsauma is concerned, as we shall see shortly. For the Synod of 410, only the (second) lemma has the anachronistic title, and this lemma is "visiblement l'œuvre du compilateur ou des copistes". ³⁶ The Synod of 420 is in

33 CHABOT, Synodicon (as note 5), 256 above translated as "l'excellence de leur charité", which is Syriac l.c., 18:27 *ḥwṣy' dḥwbhwn*; and with "la sollicitude de leur prudence", which is Syriac l.c., 18:28 *'wkpwt' dpwršnhwn. ḥwṣy'*, "reconciliation" say the lexicons, is the breastplate of the high priest of Ex 25 ff. The meaning of the vocabulary at this point in the text emerges beautifully from Ex 28:29 f.: "So Aaron shall carry the names of the sons of Israel in his breastplate on his heart when he enters the sanctuary, as a gracious memorial before the Lord at all times. 30 And you shall put in your breast pocket the lots of 'light and judgment' so that they may be on Aaron's heart when he goes in before the Lord, that he may carry the decisions for the children of Israel on his heart before the Lord at all times."

34 The following until the end of the section FIEY, Jalons (see note 1), 77.

35 FIEY, Jalons (see note 1), 77 f.

36 FIEY, Jalons (see note 1), 78.

The Synod of Acacius of 424, where the title patriarch occurs seven times (seven times also the word *katholikos* or its derivatives³⁸), is inconspicuous in this matter³⁷. In fact, it is the Synod of 424 that presents the real problem, with consequences for the integrity of its minutes, see below [9] The Synod of Acacius of 486 only knows the title *katholikos* (in the lemma)³⁹ and *episkopos katholikos* (in the beginning of the minutes and in the list of signatures at the end).

Fiey then speaks of the "Acts" of the Synod of (Metropolitan) Barsauma of 484/40, where the title patriarch does not appear. Fiey's reference for this However, "files" ⁴¹ does not refer to the files, but to the compiler's notification that he had *not* included these files in his collection and why: Barsauma and his fellow synod members revoked these acts and thus rendered them invalid. In this communication from the compiler, Acacius is called "Katholikos Patri- arch", and there is talk of the "patriarchal" province of Seleukia-Ktesiphon.

The compiler's reference to the repository of the texts, the archive of the "patriarchate" ⁴², is due to the translator Chabot, for in Syriac it is called "archive of the *katholikos*." ⁴³ If "patriarch" etc. goes back to the habit of the later compiler, then Chabot's mistranslation (we have already found an analogous confusion above⁴⁴) shows how easily the titles and their derivatives were interchangeable once they were both in use side by side.

In view of the synod of 486, the finding in the letters of Barsauma⁴⁵ is surprising; here one reads both titles for the Catholicos Acacius, and Fiey tends to regard this as a change due to tradition. I myself would like to follow him, but there are substantive reasons for not doing so: Barsauma not only works with the concept of the paternity of the chief bishop, for which the patriarchal-

37 FIEV, Jalons (see note 1), 78. Of course, the "paternité" of the Catholicos is mentioned twice, CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 277, and also once in the protocol of 410, *ibid.*, 265. "Father" was a very common form of address for a bishop. The abstract term was later associated with the Patriarch title.

38 FIEV, Jalons (as note 1), 78. "Katholikat" in the lemma CHABOT, Synodicon (as note 5), 43/285 and 45.6/288 in the text.

39 FIEV, Jalons (see note 1), 79. On Barsauma and his synods, see S. GERO, Baršauma of Nisibis and Persian Christianity in the fifth century, CSCO 426, Subs. 63, 1981 and my section in Grillmeier/Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* 2/6 (not yet published).

40 FIEV, Jalons (see note 1), 79.

41 FIEV, Jalons (see note 1), 79 note 64, CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 308-309.

42 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 309 above.

43 Syriac CHABOT, Synodicon (as note 5), 61.18.

44 See above section I, note 25. Cf. also CHABOT, Synodicon (as note 5), 535 note 1: "<...> élu Acacius comme patriarche <...>", where it should correctly read "catholicos".

45 On the transmission of these letters in two groups, see CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 531 and the scribal note, *op. cit.*, 539 with Chabot's note 2.

title could be an occasion, but above all, and this is decisive, he uses the title "Father of Fathers", which is a paraphrase for "Patriarch". I do not think that a copyist who habitually uses "Katholikos" and "Patriarch" side by side, because they are interchangeable, would also have used the paraphrased title mechanically. I summarize the findings in Bar[10]sauma (is it just *my* impression that the form of address "o father" plays a special role?)

First letter of Barsauma (Synodicon Orientale, 531 f.), written in the name of a group of bishops around Barsauma to another, smaller group of bishops.

Beginning: "Après que j'eus souscrit à la sentence auprès de Notre Père Mar Acacius,

patriarch <...>"

Second letter (Synodicon Orientale, 532-534), address and sender:

"Au vénérable ami de Dieu Mar Acacius, *patriarche*; - Ton affectionné (the one who loves you) Bar Çauma: Paix en Notre-Seigneur". Conclusion: "<...> maintenant, nous sommes pour toujours les disciples et les sujets du siège de *Votre Paternité*. - Porte-toi bien en Notre-Seigneur et prie pour nous".

Third letter (Synodicon Orientale, 534-536), address and sender:

"Au venerable ami de Dieu, Mar Acacius, *patriarche*; - Ton affectionné Bar Çauma: Paix en Notre-Seigneur". At the beginning: "<...> ô vénérable et saint *Père des pères*, Mar Acacius, archévêque, *patriarche* <...> ô père miséricordieux."; p. 535: "*Votre Paternité*" three times; conclusion p. 536: "Ayez un souvenir dans vos prières de la nuit et du jour, ô notre Père honoré et choisi de Dieu <...>".

Fourth letter (Synodicon Orientale, 536 f.), address and sender:

"Au vertueux et saint ami du Christ notre Père Mar Acacius, évêque et⁴⁶ catholicos; - Ton affectionné Bar Çauma: paix en Notre-Seigneur".

At the end: "<...> et prie pour nous, ô notre Père".

(Fifth) letter (Synodicon Orientale, 538), lemma: "Nous écrivons la lettre de Bar Çauma, métropolitain de Nisibe, à Mar Acacius, catholicos".

Address and sender: "Au vénérable saint et ami de Dieu, notre Père Mar Acacius, évêque et catholicos; - Ton affectionné Bar Çauma: Paix en Notre-Seigneur".

Beginning: "Nous avons prouvé de tout temps à *Ta Paternité* l'accord de notre esprit <...>".

⁴⁶ So again in the address of the (5th) letter, see below; once also in the *corpus* of the 1st letter, CHABOT, Synodicon (as note 5), 532. This "and" seems to cancel out my correction of Chabot's comma between "évêque" and "catholicos". However, the conjunction "and" occurs between the heiden title components within the edition of the Synodicon Orientale only in these letters. The insertion must date from a time when the full title "episkopos katholikos" was no longer used and katholikos was only understood as a noun. This minor detail reflects the special tradition of the letters.

(*Sixth Letter* (Synodicon Orientale, 538 f.), lemma: "Du même Mar Bar Çauma à Mar Acacius, catholicos, *patriarche*".

Address and sender: "Au vénérable et saint ami du Christ Mar Acacius, évêque, *patriarche*; - Ton affectionné Bar Ç a u m a : Paix en Notre-Seigneur".

[11] Conclusion: "Prie pour nous, ô notre Père, *et ne te souviens plus de nos aberrations*".

This final petition is to be taken quite literally if one remembers Barsauma's synodal event in Beit Lapat. Here we find the key to Barsauma's use of an exaggerated titulature that was previously unusual in his church: there are just as many *captationes benevolentiae*. The repeated affirmation of his affection for the Catholicos belongs to the same style. It is easy to imagine that the catholicos Acacius (485-495/6) and his successor Babai (497-502/3) felt no inclination to adopt into ecclesiastical usage a title that the rebel Barsauma had added to the usual titulature for all too transparent reasons. The attempt as such, however, presupposes that "patriarch" was by now common in the Church of the Roman Empire for a senior bishop. In Actio III of the Council of Chalcedon 451, the imperial commissioners apostrophized "the very venerable patriarchs of every diocese", οἱ ὁσιώτατοι πατριάρχαι διοικήσεως ἐκάστης⁴⁷, where "diocese" is a term of state organization.

For the purposes of our question, it would be interesting to see the title patriarch applied to the bishop of Antioch *in the 5th century*. With the affair of Barsauma, we find ourselves not only in the dispute over the Tris-hagion, but also at the beginning of the Acacian Schism (484-518) between Rome and Constantinople. There is an account of the course of events by Eduard Schwartz (1934)⁴⁸, which also contains a list of documents⁴⁹. Schwartz himself consistently uses "patriarch" for the senior bishops. One of the collections of sources on the schism is the Collectio Avellana⁵⁰ ("Epistolae imperatorum pontificum aliorum") edited by Otto Guenther in CSEL 35.1.2 in 1908, the texts of which range from 367 to 553. A general observation can be made quickly with the help of Guenther's indices: the papal chancery in Rome did *not* use the patriarchal nomenclature *at all*, neither for its own see nor for the sees of equal rank in the east of the empire. This should be noted for the chief bishops of Antioch in Roman titles.

⁴⁷ ACO II, p. 78,26. - This is the passage to which Fiey refers when he makes Chalcedon the *w a t e r s h e d* for the special use of the title patriarch for the chief bishop.

⁴⁸ E. SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma*, ABAW Phil. hist. Cl. NF 10, 1934.

⁴⁹ SCHWARTZ, *Acacian Schism* (see note 48), 161-170.

⁵⁰ Schwartz always refers to it this way because the title chosen by editor Guenther is too cumbersome and unspecific.

Conversely, however, in the letters of others to Rome, the Roman bishop, the *papa*, [12] is addressed (as has long been customary) as patriarch and/or as *pater patrum*⁵¹; *pater patrum* is nothing other than an explanatory translation of *patriarcha* ("father of fathers" as a translation of "patriarch" also in Barsauma, see above). The oldest example in Coll. Avellana is probably letter no. 80, a letter from the bishops of Dardania (a Balkan province) to Gelasius (who in no. 79 simply calls himself *episcopus*) from the year 494: "Domino sancto apostolico et beatissimo *patri patrum* Gelasio papae urbis Romae humiles episcopi Dardaniae" ⁵² - thus in the address, a few lines further on also in the salutation: *pater patrum*⁵³; for the rest, the genuine Roman vocabulary of *apostolica sedes* is used (see also the address).

Otherwise, in the Coll. Avellana only the bishop of Constantinople "Patriarch" and not a single one of the bishops of Antioch. For the Chalcedonian Calandion (Calendion in Guenther's Index), bishop from 481/2-485 (expelled by Peter Fullo, who thus became bishop of Antioch for the third time), this is explained by the fact that he is mentioned exclusively in the Roman letters (occasionally with the epithet *sanctus* or *catholicus*⁵⁴), mostly in connection with his expulsion by Peter. After the election of Calandion, Simplicius of Rome referred to him in a letter to Constantinople in 482 (Coll. Avell. no. 69), i.e. before the outbreak of the Acacian Schism, as "frater et coepiscopus noster" and "antistes tantae urbis", who was included in the "consortium nostrum" ⁵⁵. Fourteen years later, in 496, Gelasius of Rome, in a very long letter to the Dardanian bishops (Coll. Avell. no. 95), speaks of Kalandion as *tertia sedis episcopus*, whose deposition and substitution by the "manifest heretic" Petrus (Fullo) Acacius had permitted⁵⁶.

What the bishops of Antioch themselves thought of the title of patriarch around this time is documented by the same Peter Fullo in the Church History of Zacharias Rhetor, V 10. It is the [13] letter of an Antiochian

⁵¹ On this topic, see recently Th. HAINTHALER, Einige Überlegungen zum Titel 'Patriarch des Westens', in: Th. HAINTHALER/F. MALI/G. EMMENEGGER (EDS.), *Unity and Catholicity of the Church*, Innsbruck/Vienna 2009.

⁵² CSEL 35.1; 223.12 f.

⁵³ Line 18: Guenther's excellent index inadvertently omits the two references, 223.12 f. 18 for *pater patrum*. Without Schwartz's table of contents and partial edition of Cod. Berol. 79 in SCHWARTZ, *Acacianisches Schisma* (see note 48), 61 ff. I would not have found the characteristic form of address. In his analysis of Cod. Berol. 79, Schwartz quotes the expression, 106 in the lemma of no. 40 ("patri patrum"), but refers for the text to Coll. Avellana no. 80.

⁵⁴ "Catholicus" here of course means "orthodox" in the sense of Chalcedonian.

⁵⁵ CSEL 35.1; 155:1-4.

⁵⁶ CSEL 35,1: 384,1-13.

Synod of 485 under Bishop Peter to Peter (Mongus) of Alexandria⁵⁷; it says⁵⁸:

When we came together and were received by our faithful *father*, the *patriarch Peter*, who clearly showed us kindness and kindness, we were in harmony with him in all things, and he with us, and we were united in the service of the Spirit⁵⁹. In the same letter, Peter of Alexandria is referred to at the beginning as archbishop⁶⁰ and likewise later Acacius of Constantinople⁶¹. It cannot be assumed that predecessors or successors of the Antiochian Peter were content with a lesser title. In any case, this provides an Antiochian model for Barsauma's flattering use of the patriarchal title for his

Katholikos before.

The minutes of the synod of the Catholicos Babai from 497 also require closer examination, because the title patriarch is found here more often than it might appear according to a remark by Fiey⁶², but interestingly not in those places where the *topos* of paternity is used or where there is specific mention of the recognition of Babai's person in his office. According to the above, anachronism cannot serve as an absolute criterion for exclusion *here* either.

According to the list of participants *within* the minutes (a different and not quite identical one precedes the minutes⁶³), we read [14]: "We have

57 The letter is no. 64 in the list of documents in SCHWARTZ, *Acacianisches Schisma* (see note 48), 165 f.: "Letter from a synod of the bishops of the Antiochian diocese summoned to Antioch by the emperor" (= Zeno) "concerning the newly installed patriarch Peter (the Walker) and the appointment of the bishops of the Antiochian diocese.

the Henotikon to Petrus Mongos <...>". In the "Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur" (in the 1998 edition and all subsequent editions), an accident seems to have happened with the keyword "Zacharias Rhetor" as far as church history is concerned. One reads: "It is not based on documents, but exclusively reflects the personal experiences of Z."! The opposite is the case, as our letter shows; the documents also include the Henotikon.

58 Ed. E. W. Brooks, CSCO 83 (Syr. 38) textus; 234,14-19; 87 (41) versio; 162,2-6.

The translation is that of K. AHRENS and G. KRÜGER (heavily revised by me), *Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor*, Leipzig 1899, 81. Brooks has no indices apart from a list of notable Syriac words, whereas the German volume has 95 pages of notes, which Brooks calls *doctissimae*, plus various other aids, including an index of names. With the help of this, one discovers that Petrus Fullo is only called patriarch at this point.

59 Surely that means that they celebrated a church service together.

60 AHRENS/KRÜGER, *Kirchengeschichte* (see note 58): "Oberbischof".

61 So no automatic use of the title Patriarch yet!

62 FIEV, *Jalons* (see note 1), 80 note 69, see again below.

63 There is also the list of signatures. CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 310 note 3 draws attention to the differences between the lists and refers to the treatment of the problem in one of his appendices. This is CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 620 f., note II, where he solves almost all the difficulties. In the "Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte" by Jedin/Latourette/Martin, Freiburg 1970, map 10 A gives the bishoprics of the "Persian church in the year 497" (authors: J.-M. FIEV/J. Mar-tin; 16*); in the legend it would be better to read "seat of the *catholicos*" instead of "of the patriarch". "In the year 497

but all gathered in good will and love to honor and greet our father, the revered Mar Babai, Catholicos "64. "He has received us with love as brothers and members of this *paternal* rule (*ršnwt*) "65 - one should probably add in thought: "of the Catholicos of Seleukia-Ktesiphon". The reason for the assembly was an edict by the Great King Zamasp, which demanded a marriage decree for the entire clergy⁶⁶. A corresponding reform was decided upon, which applied from the "*patriarch* to the lowest in the covenant", i.e. the clergy. With regard to "only this point", the synod of Beit Lapat (that of Barsauma of 484)⁶⁷ was accepted, the agreement of Beit 'Edrai (between the Catholic Acacius and Barsauma), the synod of Acacius and the true faith. The mutual anathemas and interdicts between Acacius and Barsauma and their followers in the years from 491 to 497 are annulled, the documents must be torn up and no one is allowed to keep them⁶⁸. So much for the reappraisal of the past.

"*Maintenant et desormais*" (*wmkyl whl* Synodicon Orientale, 64.3/313.4 "and from now on") affirms loyalty to Babai, the "*episkopos* katholikos⁶⁹, head, ruler, commander and plenipotentiary" - the title "patriarch" is not included in this series. If Ba[15]bai had wanted to use it, then it could have been listed in this order, alongside all the vocabulary of administration and governance (see also above).

The natural transition from the unpleasant past to the good propositions of the "now" is interrupted by a passage (Synodicon Orientale, 64,1-3/313,1-3) that is much more general:

a well-attended synod took place, the records of which have been preserved. However, not only the bishoprics mentioned in these acts were included, but also those which, although not in 497, are attested at synods before and after." (p. 16*).

64 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 311. "Patriarch" could well have been added here, if it had corresponded to the Katholikos would have arrived at it. A similar case a little further down.

65 At this point (CHABOT, Synodicon (as note 5), 63,9) I have translated the Syriac vocabulary with the strong synonym "dominion", because the "primacy" is what I prefer in the following, cannot participate as a brother.

66 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 312. On this see S. GERÖ, Die antiasketische Bewegung im persischen Christentum - Einfluss zoroastrischer Ethik?, in: III. Symposium Syriacum 1980, OCA 221, 1983, 187-191, there, p. 190 f. on the edict of Zamasp, who "defended orthodox Zoroastrianism against the heresy of the Mazdakites". The latter had advocated a women's community. "There is evidence that the Persian Christians supported the suppression of this sect". "Convergence of interests", but no Zoroastrian "influence".

67 The excerpts of Ebedjesus with the marriage regulations of the Synod of Beit Lapat near Chabot reproduced and translated, see CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 623-625.

68 See also GERO, Baršauma of Nisibis (see note 39), 53-59 on the possible background to those disputes.

69 Chabot translates, following his habit: "évêque, comme catholicos".

"But we also agree with the correct laws laid down in synods by the earlier Fathers, which justly justify the honor and primacy (*ršnwt'*) of this *apostolic see of the great Church of Kōkē*. "70

As a connection to what has gone before, this is not initially disruptive, but the new temporal insertion with "and from now on" is now disruptive. This suggests that these few lines are an insertion (as usual, it only becomes noticeable at the end); in addition to the formal aspect, there is the content aspect: part of the patriarchal topicality (the connection to the - large - church of Kōkē and the apostolicity of the throne of Seleukia) is presented, as Mar Aba will develop it, but neither "patriarchal" nor "patriarch" appears here either.

The declaration of loyalty to Babai is followed (as the third section of *Synodicon Orientale*, 313) by a series of measures against anyone who wants to "oppose this primacy and this seat of the Fathers" and "separate himself from the body of his brothers, the bishops of the whole East": first of all, admonition by the brothers; if this does not help, communion with him is deemed to be dissolved unless he comes to the *patriarch* and agrees in writing to what has now been decided, like a (good) disciple.

Two instructions are then given on the regular frequency of synods (*Synodicon Orientale*, 313, lower half): a) Provincial synods are to be held twice a year; but b) synods of the universal Church are not to be held every two years with the *Patriarch* according to the previous regulation, but every four years, unless an urgent problem causes the *Patriarch* to convene a meeting. Unjustified absences are not permitted.

Two cases of such absences are condemned. a) Bishop Papa of Beit Lapat had to agree to the "orthodox faith" (so he was probably a radical Cyrillite)⁷¹; a synod had already placed him under [16] anathema once, and he was thus deposed⁷². b) The second case is that of the metropolitan of Persis⁷³, who was given a deadline to come to "our father, Mar Babai, *katholikos*" to greet and venerate him; if he did not do so and did not join the *katholikos*, communion with him was suspended and he was deposed. This bishop was

⁷⁰ CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 313 note 1, remarks on this: "Allusion à l'interdiction d'en appeler de la sentence du patriarche à celui d'Antioche. Cf. ci-dessus, p. 296", - this refers to the Synod of 424. Even if the relevant statements of 424 were genuine, our passage does not represent a such an allusion; rather, it concerns the primacy *within* the Persian church.

⁷¹ Consider the influence of Philoxenus at this time. Thus also LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 157.

⁷² Among the signatories of our Synod of 497, the deacon of the church is in second place of Beit Lapat, metropolis of Beit Huzaye, on behalf of its metropolitan Marwei.

⁷³ Even the bishop of distant Merw (today in southern Turkmenistan) may have been present, No. 13 on the list of signatures; however, he is missing from the list of participants in the minutes, He may have signed it retrospectively like others. In any case, he does not lack recognition.

was therefore not prepared to recognize the primacy of the bishop of Seleukia-Ktesiphon as *episkopos katholikos*.

After a general declaration of consent (Synodicon Orientale, 314 below) to what has been written down so far, there follows (314 f.) a regulation on the validity of bishop elections from the time of the dispute (namely between Barsauma and Acacius), provided that they were carried out according to the canonical rules and that no one took advantage of the situation to usurp the office irregularly.

The synodal protocol is not signed in the first place by the *katholikos*, but by his archdeacon Šila (certainly the author of the protocol)⁷⁴, in this signature Babai is once called "episkopos katholikos of the East" and once "Katholikos". In the signature in 11th place, where two priests represent Bishop Šila of Hormizd-Ardasir, consent to the Synod of Babai, *Patriarch* of the East, is declared. *This is the only case in the entire protocol where this title is assigned to one of the katholikai by name*, otherwise both Acacius and Babai are always called *katholikos* with their title of chief bishop.

In the note mentioned above, Fiey⁷⁵ refers to the Synod of 497 as the possibly the earliest possible use of the title "patriarch" for the Catholicos. He only finds the title in one place (Synodicon Orientale, 313), "dans la citation d'un canon qui était encore en vigueur au temps du compilateur et dont le texte semble bien avoir été mis à jour. Partout ailleurs le titre de catholicos est seul employé". My presentation above shows that Fiey's observation needs to be revised considerably. The canon mentioned by Fiey is the regulation on the frequency of general synods (Synodicon Orientale, 313 below). Fiey is certainly correct in his assumption that the use of the title patriarch in the minutes [17] of this synod is a later custom⁷⁶. However, "patriarch" should probably not simply be deleted, but rather replaced by "katholikos". The insertion I marked above represents a different kind of intervention; it was certainly made by the same hand that glossed the link between the primacy and the Church of Kōkē in two cases in the canons of the Synod of 410.

Fiey organizes a "cross-check" for his conclusion that the title "patriarch" in its appearance in the Syrian Synodal Acts before the end of the 5th century, "et a fortiori en 424", should be regarded as an interpolation. The crosscheck reads⁷⁷: "Supposons que le siège de Séleucie-Ctésiphon soit devenu 'patriarcal' en 424; puisqu'en 451 l'Église de Perse n'était pas encore devenue nestorienne et n'était donc pas séparée de l'Église universelle, on aurait trouvé des traces de cette décision

⁷⁴ His later successor, CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 315 note 1.

⁷⁵ FIEV, Jalons (see note 1), 80 note 69.

⁷⁶ Presumably, when the marriage regulations were later changed, the protocol of 497 and copied it out, taking the opportunity to update the title quite casually.

⁷⁷ FIEV, Jalons (see note 1), 80 note 79.

dans les actes du concile de Chalcédoine, ne serait-ce que dans le fameux canon 28 qui consacre la pentarchie de Rome, Constantinople, Alexandrie, Jérusalem et Antioche". But the "famous 28th canon" of 451 has the function of providing the bishop of Constantinople as bishop of the "new Rome" with a precisely defined upper metropolitan area (namely the territory of the imperial dioceses of Thrace, Pontus, Asia, i.e. an area of enormous extent); at the beginning, the canon gives a justification for the Roman-like rank of Constantinople, which had only been simply stated in c. 3 of 381 (to which reference is made)⁷⁸. The other members of what is later called the pentarchy are not mentioned at all in c. 28. The fundamental error of Fiey's small section, however, is that it fails to recognize the character of an imperial or imperial council such as the Synod of 451; it could only pass resolutions for the oikumene of the *Roman Empire*.

[18] 3 Mar Aba

"En fait il semble que ce ne soit qu'à partir de Mār Ābā, en 544, que les deux titres de catholicos et de patriarche aient été employés équivalement dans les synodes"⁷⁹. And this was a time in which the title patriarch was in general use in the Roman Empire for the chief bishop in church and state, as Justinian's novels and the Acts of the Council attest, especially for Antioch and the Chalcedonian holder of this see in these decades, Ephraem (527-545)⁸⁰. The date 544 given by Fiey can still be pushed back to the year 540, in which Aba⁸¹ was elected Catholicos and immediately began his visitation of the church of the Persian Empire in order to eliminate the consequences of the double election of 524⁸², for which the term of office of his immediate predecessor Paul in the year

⁷⁸ As is well known, the Roman rank and its justification caused the greatest offense in Rome, and the dispute between "old" and "new" Rome is what makes c. 28 so famous. An example from the Acacian controversy is the above-mentioned letter of the Roman bishop Gelasius, Coll.

Avellana No. 95, to the bishops of the province of Dardania, in which the Roman mocks (CSEL 35,1; 387,16-19):

"Risimus autem, quod praerogativam volunt Acacio comparari, quia episcopus fuerit regiae civitatis. numquid apud Ravennam, apud Mediolanum, apud Sirmium, apud Triveros multis temporibus non constitit imperator?" Cf. in c. 28: "<...> primatum reddimus iuniori Romae <...> ut qui regno et senato honorificatur civitas <...> secundam post eam (sc. magnam Romam) esse censemus." The problem s. a. DE HALLEUX, *Les deux Rome dans la définition de Chalcédoine sur les prérogatives du siège de Constantinople*, in: *Mémoire Mgr. Maxime de Sardes* (Geneva) = *Patrologie et Œcuménisme*, Leuven 1990, 504-519 with the sovereignty that characterizes him.

⁷⁹ FIEV, *Jalons* (see note 1), 80.

⁸⁰ Kind reference from Th. Hainthaler.

⁸¹ "Mar" in Aba is the title "Lord" to which every bishop and *a fortiori* every catholicos is entitled. In the In the case of Aba, it has become customary to treat it as part of the name.

⁸² LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 159-167 on Šīla (505-523), the successor of the Catholicos Babai, and on the subsequent turmoil after the double election of 524 and the conditions until 539.

539 had been far too short. With Paul's election, the "duality⁸³ of the Catholicate" had ceased.

As clear as it is that Mar Aba called himself patriarch, it remains uncertain whether his predecessor Paul was already endowed with the title. It is certainly no coincidence that the title came into use now, after the schism had been eliminated, because the winners of the double election of 524 both considered themselves C a t h o l i c and called themselves that. As a result, this title could easily be regarded as compromised and could therefore be put to good use by reinforcements⁸⁴ - anything that could support the primacy and authority of the bishop of Seleucia-Ktesiphon was used⁸⁵. There is perhaps an analogy to the presumed introduction of the title catholicos after the long period of persecution in the 4th century. After times of decline, a title was chosen that distinguished the bishop of the capital from all the other bishops of his church: *episkopos katholikos* stands for the claim to preside over the "whole", "patriarch" confers a rapturous dignity of "age" in both the spiritual and ministerial sense and at the same time contains the emotional^[19] element of paternity⁸⁶ (which Barsauma already made use of).

The emphasis on the supreme office in its importance for the restoration and preservation of the unity of the church became an almost desperate necessity after Mar Aba was accused by the representatives of the Persian religion and banished to a distant exile in Azerbaijan, from where he had to hold his barely reformed church together. He succeeded in doing so to the extent that no counter-Catholicos/patriarch rose up. Admittedly, in the minutes of the synod of 554, his successor Joseph speaks of the difficulties that prevailed during his predecessor's years of imprisonment⁸⁷: "Cela avait permis à certains turba- teurs et corrupteurs d'accomplir le dessein de leur malice, de troubler l'ordre con- venable, de fouler aux pieds les canons ecclésiastiques et de mépriser les préceptes divins, de semer la zizanie, c'est-à-dire les troubles et les divisions, et de susciter des revoltes".

In the following, I will examine Mar Aba's synodal texts in the order in which Chabot printed them in the *Synodicon Orientale*, i.e. divided into main part and appendix, although I do not agree with this distribution.

The compilation of the "ecclesiastical writings" of Mar Abas was undertaken in January 544, "after the Archbishop, Patriarch, had been engaged in the struggle for the

⁸³ This is the expression Mar Aba uses throughout.

⁸⁴ The older title was not abandoned, but upgraded.

⁸⁵ Remember Barsauma's flattering use of the title?

⁸⁶ This point of view is also important to J. HABBI in his article: La structure patriarcale de l'église in: R. COPPOLA (ed.), *Incontro fra canonici d'Oriente e d'Occidente*, Bari 1994, 157-82.

⁸⁷ CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 353.

⁸⁸ CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 318.

name of Christ and the canons of the holy church and he was sent into exile because of this struggle, for the sake of the truth "89. Six documents are listed90. The preface 20] to this collection gives the promulgation.

89 CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 319.

90 The title of No. 1 contains two words of obvious Greek origin whose original spelling and meaning are not easy to ascertain. The title is given twice, in two different forms, and the spelling of the longer of the two words is not quite identical. In the *list* of documents, CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 319 has "le synode orthodoxe des réformes provinciales"; the last two words translate, 69,17 *prksymstȳ' hgmwnqy'*. The *heading* of the document in Chabot's translation, 320: "Pragmatique des réformes provinciales" for Syriac, 69.24 *prsymstȳqwn dtwrs' hgmwnqy'*. In the first of the Syriac words, a *qof* is missing in the form in which the list spells it compared to the heading; conversely, a *kaf* is missing in the heading compared to the list. Spelling mistake in the source? Printing error?

Let's start with the second or third of the two words, with *hgmwnqy'* (or *hgmwnyqy'*). The Greek adjective ἡγεμονικός is readily recognizable in this, see also CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 319 note 2. But the adjective first appears lexicographically as a *Syriac* loanword in Mrs. Margoliouth's *Supplementum* (1927) to the *Thesaurus Syr.* She gives two examples and two meanings. The first example [20] comes from a manuscript of philosophical content, which she translates as "authoritative"; the second example is our two passages (the edition of the *Synodicon Orientale* was not yet available for the *Thesaurus* itself), for which Chabot's translation "provincial" is adopted and this is classified as ecclesiastical usage ("Eccles.").

The difficult *prks//* or *prs//* appears in the *Thesaurus* (col. 3265), written in the plenior form (with 3 *yod*) and with the *kaf* after the initial *pr*; the translation "libri correctionum imperialium" naturally also reproduces the two words following *prk//*. The source for the *thesaurus* is Bar Bahlul's Syriac-Arabic lexicon, which quotes from the text of the Acts, which corresponds to p. 69.24 in Chabot's print (following the linguistic development, the *h* of ἡγεμονικός has become *ʿy* in Bar Bahlul). Bar Bahlul's translation, which is an explanation, reads: *tš'yt' dtwrs' mdbnr'yt*. Chabot has dealt with the vocabulary in *Synodicon* (see note 5), 319 note 2. With regard to Bahlul's translation (which Chabot has a misprint: an *alaf* for a *tau*), he quotes the Latin translation by Duval: *narrationes correctionum oeconomice*. Regarding the crux *prk//*, Chabot says: It is

"composé avec πρᾶξις et un autre élément que je ne saurais reconnaître". Chabot's translation and Bar Bahlul's rendering of *hgmwnqy'* as "provincial" or "oeconomice" are explained by the fact that they must derive the vocabulary from the Syriac foreign word *hegemon* as a *noun*, the title for the provincial prefect etc., i.e. referring to the provincial administration or to *administration* in general, Greek οἰκονομία, Syriac *mdbrnwt'*. Mrs. Margoliouth takes over the puzzling vocabulary *prk//* from the *Thesaurus* into the *Supplement* (p. 276) and corrects CHABOT, *Synodicon* (as note 5), 69,17 and 24 thereafter. She wants to recognize παρασχηματιστικοί as the underlying Greek word; this has the advantage that the *m* is taken into account, and the disadvantage that a metathesis of *k* and *s* is assumed. But the Syrians were quite familiar with πρᾶξις as a foreign word, and in transliteration without any metathesis. Mrs. Margoliouth translates the verb in context as "(books) about change (or) reforms". But the verb παρασχηματίζω is unsuitable for explanation. In PGL it has three meanings, all of negative content: 1. disguise, 2. feign, 3. treat in unseemly fashion. The basic meaning is found in Sophocles, Greek Lexicon, according to grammarians of the 2nd and 4th (?) centuries:

"to form alongside, formation from"; it can be seen that the meanings given in PGL are derived from this.

M. In my opinion, the first half of *prk//* contains the Greek πρᾶξις, Liddell/Scott s.v. ἡ τὰ πρᾶξιμα "practical aims". The "other element", which Chabot was unable to recognize, would like to

authority⁹¹: Mar Aba, Patriarch, and the metropolitans and other bishops (who, astonishingly,[21] were able to assemble with him in some numbers at the place of banishment); the date is given after the years of the reign of the Great King and those of Mar Aba: "in the 5th year *of the Catholic government* (= government by the Catholicos) *of the Patriarchate* of the Holy Archbishop Mar Aba, Catholicos, Patriarch". A carefully considered hendiadyoin of the two titles is formulated here.

This is followed⁹² by the memory of the elimination of the "duality"⁹³ with its result

nis: The duality of the Catholicate, introduced by Elisha and Narsai, has ceased, the unity *of the Catholic administration of the Patriarchate* has been restored in Seleucia-Ktesiphon, throughout the East and the neighboring territories through the zeal of Archbishop Mar Aba, Patriarch, and the holy Synod of Metropolitans and Bishops with him. The reform writings are compiled to fortify and support the canons relating to the unity *of Catholic administration*, which, according to *apostolic tradition*, is entrusted to the patriarchal throne of the Church of Kōkē⁹⁴ in

I trace it back to στίζω, Liddell/Scott s.v. II "put a punctuation mark"; there is the verbal adjective στικτέον, which belongs to the second meaning: "one must put a punctuation mark". Thus one could postulate a Greek παραξιμοστίκ(ε)ον, "point to be dealt with (or here rather: dealt with)". With ἡγεμονικόν in the sense of "principal" (see PGL s.v. I. A.2 "principal"), this would result in Mar Aba's formulation: "the main points dealt with". The great difficulty is that the hypothetical παραξιμοστίκ(ε)ον would be just as much a *hapax legomenon* in Greek as the Syriac form actually is. It cannot be found in the newer dictionaries of Byzantine Greek either (kind information from my colleague K. Metzler). I think it is quite possible that Mar Aba himself was involved in creating the language! But why the effort?

⁹¹ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 318.

⁹² CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 318 f.

⁹³ In contrast to the other retrospectives, the predecessor Paul is not mentioned here.

⁹⁴ About the location of Kōkē (*kwk'*) between the ancient Hellenistic Seleucia and the Parthian Ktesiphon, see the drawings in FIEV, Jalons (see note 1), 42-44 with accompanying text. The area of Kōkē 230 becomes the Sassanid city of Veh Ardašir (Mahoza in Jewish sources - actually a generic term: "fortified city", see M. KMOŠKO, *Patrologia Syriaca* I 2, Paris 1907, 809 note 2). This city could then also be called the New Seleucia (after the old one lay in ruins) or simply Seleucia, as in our text above. Fiey's drawings also show the location of the church of Kōkē. In 1967, J.-M. FIEV wrote an essay on the "cities", which was reprinted in his anthology "Communautés syriaques en Iran et Irak des origines à 1552", Variorum 1979, 397-420: Topographie chrétienne de Mahoze. "La topographie ici proposée diffère quelquefois sensiblement des cartes dressées par les missions archéologiques allemande, américaine ou italienne qui ont fouillé le site. The key, of course, is the observation and dating of the Tigre lithic remains. La découverte de celui de 79/116 m'a été fournie d'abord par le *Talmud*; elle a été corroborée par de nombreux autres textes et vérifiée sur les photographies aériennes" (op. cit., 401). Fiey is of the opinion that the church of Kōkē, later called the "great" one, was located on the site of Mari's foundation (around the year 100); it was destroyed, rebuilt and enlarged several times. An enlargement under Mar Aba took place between 540 and 541 (not 450 and 451, as printed) (FIEV, Topography, 404), i.e. at the beginning of the Catholicos' energetic activity. But since when has the church had the epithet "the Great"? If we look in the Synodicon Orientale, which mentions Aba Kōkē *before* Mar, we find the synods of 410 and 497 (424 is not mentioned because of the spe-

of the city of Seleucia, from which all administrations of the eastern region and the neighboring areas emanate (*yld* pass.!) as far as faith and ecclesiastical Christian life are concerned.

Patriarchy is therefore not only authority, but the source and origin of all other authority that appears to be derived from it. Seleucia-Ktesiphon is mentioned twice in this context⁹⁵.

The *first* document: "Abhandlungelte Punkte der hauptsächlichen Reform" (Synodicon Orientale, 320-332).

In fact, there are *two* texts. The second text is the trial of Abraham, "called the son of Audmihr, from Beit Lapat". This document begins syr.

p. 73,16 (translation 324 below) and its end coincides with the end of the first document. The trial takes place in Beit Lapat and has therefore been added where this metropolis is reached in the visitation report of the first part. The Syriac connection: "And because in his insolence and impudence he who is called Abraham, son of <...>", only appears smooth and natural at first glance; however, Chabot rightly begins a new paragraph, but omits the words "And because", which presuppose a lost introduction. While the first part of the document briefly covers the stages of the entire visitation in a few pages (although one stays in Rew-Ardašir "for a long time", for example), here the scandalous story of a single man who was once Metropolitan of Beit Lapat is presented in broad terms. His story begins under the Catholicos Šila, i.e. before 523, and has several phases; Mar Aba dealt with it twice. During his first investigation of the case, Abraham makes a detailed confession of guilt, in which he is not lacking in irony and can certainly compete with the supreme bishop in terms of cumbersome precision. He did not abide by the condemnation pronounced on this occasion, but instead unleashed a rebellion

problems of the files here). 410 c. VI on the assembly of bishops first quotes the canon "of the Synod" (i.e. of Nicaea) on the synods to be held twice a year. However, it is proposed that such assemblies should only take place every two years; the Grand Metropolitan, "who sits on the throne of Kōkē" (CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 25.4 f./264 f.), should issue a written invitation [22]. C. XII on the honor due to the katholikos ends with a gloss that syntactically folds back and declares itself to be a gloss by "i.e.", *hnw dyn*: the bishops promise obedience "to the *episkopos katholikos*, archbishop, metropolitan of Seleukia and Ktesiphon until the coming of Christ in everything that is commanded, i.e. to every bishop who sits on this great throne of the Church of Kōkē" (op. cit, 27,1 f./266). This suggests that the corresponding relative clause in c. VI is also an insertion by the same hand. So does the *insistence* on localization begin at the same time as the introduction of the patriarchal title?

95 In the Synod of Babai 497, the mention of the church of Kōkē belongs in an insertion about the primacy of the "apostolic seat" there, see above on CHABOT, Synodicon (as note 5), 313. Seleucia and Ctesiphon as the place of assembly (*ibid.*, 311), on the other hand, is part of the protocol.

with dire consequences for those involved, hence the final act in Beit Lapat with renewed condemnation.

[23] To return to the first part, it begins after the protocolary preliminaries (date: October 540; declaration of loyalty to the Great King) with a reference to the end of the "duality" that had ruled for fifteen years. The

"Duality" is hateful and shameful, like a woman who has two husbands or like a body with two heads (we will encounter this motif again). The unity of government (*oikonomia*) is restored on the *throne of the Patriarchate, which, according to apostolic tradition, sits in Seleucia and Ctesiphon*, the well-known cities of Beit Aramayē; from the government of this *apostolic and paternal throne* flow and are transmitted the spiritual ordinations, canonical perfection, etc. and all the orders of the apostolic priesthood for every city of all Persia, the rest of the East and the neighboring territories.

The same complex of ideas can be found here as in the preface.

In the next paragraph⁹⁶, Patriarch Mar Aba and a group of bishops set off on a visitation tour. The first stage leads to the region of Peroz-Sabor, i.e. from the "cities" in a north-westerly direction, but then to the south and south-east. Labourt remarks on the itinerary⁹⁷: "Il semble que, dans le Nord, la réforme se soit accomplie sans difficulté, soit par ce que les dérèglements y étaient moins grands, soit à cause du prestige personnel de Maraba et des métropolitains qui s'associèrent à son œuvre⁹⁸. Mais la Basse-Chaldée, la Susiane et la Perse propre, terre classique des schismes et des révoltes, réclamaient des soins particuliers". Not only were there double appointments to the episcopal sees, but also: "certains évêques s'étaient proclamés indépendants de l'un et l'autre catholicos" during the period of "bipartisanship".

At the beginning of the above passage it says: "La *faiblesse* du saint ami du Christ, le patriarche Mar Aba, fut réconfortée <...>". "Weakness", *mḥylwt*, is usually used with the 1st pers. suffix, as we would say "my humble self"⁹⁹. In the Mar Aba collection of writings, the expression continues to occur, also in the 1st pers. plur. Here we have the 3rd person and a play on words: "to be strengthened" has the radical ḥyl, "the person of the patriarch was strengthened" - by what?

[24] In this first part of Part I, Mar Aba consistently bears the title "Patriarch". In the second part, as already mentioned above, the *Katholikos* Šila is mentioned, who

⁹⁶ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 321.

⁹⁷ LABOURT, Le christianisme (see note 8), 171.

⁹⁸ But see in one of the following documents the bad news from Nisibis, which is already fall into the exile period of Mar Abas.

⁹⁹ Cf. J. PAVNE SMITH (Margoliouth), A compendious Syriac dictionary, Oxford 1903, reprint 1957. In the third letter of Barsauma we have "my" and "our weakness" (CHABOT, Synodicon (as Note 5), 535 and 536) as an indirect expression for "I" and "we". Are they perhaps particularly strong characters who love to express themselves in this way?

whom Abraham had already condemned at the time. After the end of the "duality" that Abraham had exploited, Paul, the predecessor of Mar Aba, immediately condemned him again. It is interesting for our question that the "faded Mar Paulus" is predicated with "qui était patriarche" (Syr. 74,21, transl. 326). I find this formulation striking because it does not simply insert "patriarch" after the name, but uses an identifying formula. To distinguish him from the other Paul, the metropolitan of Beit Lapat? Or is this a reference to the fact that the title "Patriarch" began with the *Catholicos* Paul?

Because of the title question and some details, let us take another look at the confession of guilt of Abraham¹⁰⁰. It begins with a narrative: After the death of Paul, "qui était évêque patriarche" (74,31 f./326) - here again the identification formula. It must be the same hand that inserted this formula in the text of Mar Aba and in the Confession of Abraham. In this second case, the title is composed of two components and is reminiscent of *episkopos katholikos*; but unlike *katholikos*, *patriarches* is clearly a noun in this composition. In any case, Abraham continues: he (sc. Paul) was followed by Mar Aba "in possession of the government of the patriarchate" (Chabot has the adjective "patriarcal").

In order to be allowed to appear at all, Abraham remains in penitential posture, barefoot on the bare ground (it was February)¹⁰¹, in front of the "House of the *Catholicos*". Finally, his case is heard in front of a large auditorium. Mar Aba gives "a great doctrinal speech" (which seems to be very characteristic of him¹⁰²), "which was appropriate to the occasion and presented the case". This is followed by an in-depth investigation and questioning, and Abraham is allowed to speak at length himself. But the result is not what Abraham had expected¹⁰³: "Tandis que je pensais que mes paroles m'innocenteraient, on y trouve la preuve de ma culpabilité". As for the question of title, we find further in the confession of guilt: "our father, the patriarch", "fatherly concern" of the Lord Patriarch; [25] but: "Šila *Katholikos*" (75,28/327), Mar Aba: *Katholikos*, Patriarch, the deceased Paul Patriarch. Mention is made of the assembly of those who were to elect him who was worthy of the patriarchate (i.e. Mar Aba); our father Mar Aba, *katholikos*.

Abraham accepts his condemnation and is the first to sign; after the witness signatures (bishops and clerics) he says: "Et sur ma demande, le ver- tueux, l' élu de Dieu, Mar Aba, évêque, patriarche, a apposé son cachet et a confirmé (cet écrit)" - so here we have the same combination of *episkopos patriarches* as above with Paul.

¹⁰⁰ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 326-328.

¹⁰¹ German readers will naturally think of King Henry IV in Canossa, at least according to the traditional version. tional depiction of his penitential walk; this depiction is largely legendary.

¹⁰² Cf. Mar Aba on himself in the second document ("On the Orthodoxy of Faith"), CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 551: "Nous vous avons *longuement* avertis d'après les Livres saints <...>".

¹⁰³ He was therefore in a different position to King Henry in Canossa, who was able to free himself from the ban.

In the report on Abraham's further behavior and the official reaction to it, the title Patriarch simply appears without a name. The final judgment begins: "I, Aba, Patriarch <...>", then "<...> we have", "<...> I, Patriarch". At the beginning of the signature list: "And I, Aba, Patriarch, have written <...>".

It is clear from the first document as a whole that Aba refers to himself as patriarch and is not merely addressed as such; that the title is consistently *not* applied to Šila, the catholicos before the "two-ness" (this suggests that Šila's predecessor Babai did not yet hold the title either); thirdly, that the title of Paul, the immediate, only briefly reigning predecessor of Mar Aba, as patriarch is given at least *ex post*. *There is* no way of determining whether he was actually called this during his term of office, nor whether he referred to himself as such.

The *III.104 document*: "On the way of life according to fixed rules" (Synodicon Orientale, 332-338).

The sender is "Aba, Patriarch", the addressee the entire clergy, starting with the metropolitans. Here too, after the introduction under the motto "Fearing God is the beginning of the right path", the reminder of "the duality on the throne of the patriarchate"; the "duality of the regime" has ceased, the "unity of the *Catholic throne*" has been established, the majority of the provinces have been reformed. Now a reform is needed for the lay faithful. A general prohibition of insubordination, conspiracy and schism is established. The rest of the text is devoted to marriage regulations.

The *IVth document* (Synodicon Orientale, 338-345), according to Segestan¹⁰⁵ (today in part in Iran, partly in southern Afghanistan)¹⁰⁶ is, as [26] shows from the entrance, already the second letter of Mar Abas in the matter discussed therein.

Here the sender refers to himself as "Aba, Katholikos". Throughout the letter, *only* this title and its derivatives are used; "patriarch" and its derivatives are *not* used *at all*. This is blurred on the first page of the translation, because Chabot once uses "patriarchate" for "catholicate" and once "patriarcal" for "Catholic" (after which his translation is correct).

Again we read the reminder of the overcome "two-ness", which is a disgrace and an anomaly in the Church of Christ, like two heads in the same body or two husbands for one wife (see Document I above). At that time, the canons and commandments of the apostles remained unheeded for a long time. The Catholicos Paul, with the help of the Great King, restored the unity of the authority of the Catholicos

¹⁰⁴ See Chabot's explanation of this paragraph in CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 332 note 4; on the placement of document II, see loc. cit. 319 note 7.

¹⁰⁵ J.-M. FIEV, *Chrétientés syriaques du Ḥorasan et Ségestan*, Muséon 86, 1973, 75-104; reprinted in *IBID.*, *Communautés syriaques* (see note 94) as no. VI.

¹⁰⁶ FIEV, *Chrétientés syriaques* (see note 105), 75, cf. the map drawing, op. cit., 78; on Mar Aba's letter *ibid.*, 95.

here. He began to determine "by the word of God"¹⁰⁷ as far as the bishops were concerned. I myself continue this, says Mar Aba, and quotes the determination made "by us" (by which he means himself and the assisting bishops), according to which Narses and Elisha had arrogated to themselves the authority of catholicos *without the consent of the two cities of Seleucia and Ctesiphon*. No one was allowed to call these two men catholicos "by the unsearchable word of God".

What was said and written by Paul and him, Mar Aba, was done in the authority of the Holy Spirit (or, a little further down: by the authority and grace of Christ our Lord). Once again (think of the earlier letter to Segestan mentioned by the author) the regulation of uncanonical occupation of bishoprics is explained. We read the incantation "par la parole de Dieu" remarkably often. The application of the regulations "dans votre pays" is explained. Now, however, a new situation has arisen: a second consecrated bishop (metropolitan) has appeared at Mar Aba and has taken an oath: since his ordination, he has never heard of the regulations since the restored unity of the Catholicate. Although he falls under the regulations and had been forbidden to exercise the office (in the earlier correspondence), "we absolved him before the Lord, gave him peace and celebrated the sacrifice with him". The good testimony of the person and the great distance of his country serve Mar Aba as justification for the exception he has decided to make. There follows a long series of provisions on how and where the person readmitted to his episcopate may work in relation to the existing bishop; Mar Aba attempts to consider in advance every possible [27] difficulty that might arise and to prescribe appropriate solutions. The text is once again interspersed with the above-mentioned invocation. Ten witnesses have signed, all bishops, one of whom is the bishop of Azerbaijan, so the letter was probably written in exile there.

What is the reason for the conspicuous frequency with which the addressees are summoned? Why invocations at all and why these? "Word of God" perhaps specifically means the Gospel book as a numinous authority present there in Segestan, while the catholicos is more distant than ever due to his exile. His authority was great enough for the disadvantaged bishop to seek him out - but it was another matter to enforce the restitution made by the Catholicos where it was supposed to work. If Mar Aba had not gone beyond the Persis to the east during his visitation, personal intervention on site was now completely impossible, hence the urgent reference to a higher authority.

What is surprising is the renunciation of any use of patriarchal vocabulary; the traditional title of Katholikos remains. The reason for this must probably lie with the

¹⁰⁷ The usual translation would be "by the word of God", but the character of an *incantation* becomes clearer with the translation given.

In addition to the drastic reform measures, could they not yet be expected to use the title because it had only just been introduced and was still unfamiliar to those distant regions¹⁰⁸? It must be remembered here that Kosmas Indikopleustes also only knew the title *Katholikos* for his friend *Patrikios* (= Aba) as the current head of the Persian church.

The *Vth document* "On definitions and canons of all distinctions of ecclesiastical administration" (Synodicon Orientale, 345-351).

This text contains the ecclesiology of Mar Abas.

The document is addressed to named metropolitans and to the bishops ("our brothers and colleagues") of named metropolitanates, including those dependent on the "patriarchal throne". Sender: "Aba, Patriarch", and greeting follow.

We and you, writes Mar Aba, who hold the keys of the kingdom of heaven, must preserve with all our soul, with all our strength¹⁰⁹ the definitions and canons of the Church of God, the Church which is the spiritual body of our Savior. We must take special care of the leaders (*mdbrn*'), without whom Christianity cannot exist. That is why Christ appointed the apostles to instruct the people.

<Christ,> après avoir opéré des signes et des prodiges, après enseigné sa doctrine, il faisait nécessairement connaître d'avance, par ses paraboles, les hérauts de son évangile et les chefs de son Église, le don céleste qu'ils devaient recevoir, la [28] puissance qu'ils ont dans les hauteurs et les profondeurs, les œuvres qui leur conviennent, leur patience dans les tourments, leurs labeurs dans la prédication de son (évangile), cette prédication elle-même et les choses qu'auraient accomplies par elle et à cause d'elle, les luttes et les épreuves qu'ils subiraient pour elle, et (chacune) des choses qui ont lieu avant nous, qui ont lieu de nos jours ou qui auront lieu après nous. Il leur interdit tout ce qui n'était pas convenable pour eux.¹¹⁰

(When he wrote this, Mar Aba was only at the beginning of his sufferings; but every bishop of his church knew what fate might be destined for him). Paul himself, continues the author, who endured so much suffering for the truth, watched over the pastors of the Church with care: he ordained metropolitans in the metropolises and bishops in the cities. The two-tiered hierarchy of bishops is thus ascribed a Pauline origin here.

"The holy fathers, who were elected after the apostles, followed in their footsteps." The following lines look *back* on the already long history of the *three-tiered hierarchy of bishops*, project the title of *patriarch* into an earlier time, as far as the Persian Church itself is concerned, and declare this order of the Church to be a

¹⁰⁸ How much greater was the distance from the Patriarchate of Antioch!

¹⁰⁹ Conscious reminder of the commandment of love.

¹¹⁰ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 346-347.

work of the Holy Spirit; in passing, the maintenance of the hierarchical order in the "territory of the West" is idealized (Synodicon Orientale, 347-348):

There was neither a metropolitan nor an évêque who wanted to break the limits assigned by the patriarch, nor an évêque who would allow himself to move beyond the metropolitan; mais le véritable évêque connaissait le temps auquel il devait se rendre près du métropolitain, et le métropolitain sage n'oubliait pas le temps où il devait aller trouver le patriarche, ainsi qu'on peut le voir *dans la région occidentale* et dans les régions voisines; because, *although schisms and disputes have arisen there, for various reasons, on the subject of faith, yet, as far as discipline is concerned, it is the apostolic canons*, la hiérarchie sacerdotale et les définitions ecclésiastiques, *personne n'oserait les y mépriser*, avec (l'espoir d') échapper à la punition et à la juste condamnation de son mépris. Quand des choses ont été justement définies par un évêque quel qu'il soit, aucun de ceux soumis à sa juridiction ne peut les annuler; de même, l'évêque ne peut annuler ou transgresser les choses justement prohibées ou définies par un métropolitain; de même aussi, les métropolitains et les évêques ne peuvent abroger ou annuler les choses justement prohibées ou définies par le patriarche; *car le Saint-Esprit a ordonné la hiérarchie sacerdotale de telle sorte* que les ordres inférieurs dépend des moyens, et les moyens des supérieurs, comme des degrés par lesquels montent ceux qui sont dignes de recevoir la promesse de l'ascension dans les cieux

and others into the depths of punishment because they did not obey the truth.

A practical conclusion follows: Convocations to synods by patriarchs, metropolitans and bishops are to be obeyed immediately. But then the thought takes a surprising turn; obviously the concrete occasion for the whole letter is announced here, even if Mar [29] Aba initially makes general determinations again: if the metropolitans or bishops (want to) assemble at the seat of the patriarch, and accordingly at the metropolitan or bishop,

and if, for any reason, the patriarch or the metropolitan does not reside in his residence, the metropolitans and the bishops may not enter the town where the patriarch's seat is located, or, if they do enter, they may not in any way prescribe, act or issue writs, relative to the government or to ecclesiastical affairs, without him or without his permission,¹¹¹

they may not even exercise their ministry (= *celebrate the Eucharist?*) without him. The same applies to the bishops at the seat of the metropolitan, if the patriarch is not present. This is how it has always been done in our Church; contradictions have been resolved.

In the fifteen years of the "two-ness", however, the disorder has grown unbearably. Its elimination is described in the familiar way¹¹². But now two cases have arisen that call for intervention: Metropolitan Paul of Beit Lapat has died, *and we cannot go down*, as we are asked to do, to settle the succession. There has been unrest in Nisibis for several years: the

¹¹¹ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 348.

¹¹² Through the Catholicos Paul and "our weakness" (= "yours truly").

Bishop is oppressed, lives (locked?) in his house, *and we are forced to move up. At the moment our situation is full of difficulties, we cannot convene a synod.* As long as this situation lasts, and so that the same thing does not happen as in the past in Persis, where some usurped metropolitan authority without the consent of the Catholicos, we decree that neither in Beit Lapat nor in Nisibis nor elsewhere will a metropolitan or bishop be appointed without our authorization, presence or letters. The usual graduated punishments for transgressions, for the annulment of apostolic tradition and ecclesiastical canons follow. The incantation "by the word of God", which appeared so frequently in the letter to Segestan, is also used here.

The letter is brought to the addressees by a messenger (probably identical to one of the episcopal signatories), who is to collect the signatures and return the signed document to Mar Aba. Mar Aba is the first to sign: "I, Aba, Patriarch", followed by seventeen more signatures.

With this text, Mar Aba attempted to *prevent faits accomplis* at two important metropolitan sees; it is not known how he solved the problems *positively* (in writing and through representatives, as personal appearances were out of the question). In any case, he kept the reins of church government in his hands even in this situation.

[30] The *second document*: "On the Orthodoxy of Faith" (Synodicon Ori- entale, 550-553).

Here Mar Aba refers to himself as the sender with the double title "Kathohkos, Patriarch of the East". Incidentally, this is a presentation of the doctrine of the Trinity and Christology, which I discuss elsewhere¹¹³.

The *VI document*: "From the VI letter, which is headed *Praktikē* "¹¹⁴ (Synodicon Orientale, 553-555).

This text deals with the regulation of succession in the patriarchate itself, namely how to proceed with the election and consecration of the successor in the event of the death of the current holder. As this regulation belongs to the writings compiled by Mar Aba in 544 (i.e. a few years after his election), i.e. written at the place of exile, it can be taken as an indication of how dangerous the author's life was.

¹¹³ In the chapter on Mar Aba in Grillmeier/Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* 2/6 (not yet printed).

¹¹⁴ CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 543, note 1 on the Syriac text: "Ce titre est tiré de la citation empruntée au synode de Timothée ^{1er}; cf. ci-dessous, p. 602, 1. 15. Le fragment est aussi cité par 'Ebed- jesus, Tr. IX, ch. ii, et par Élie de Nisibe (probablement d'après Timothée) <...> (cf. Bibl. Or. III, p. 1, p. 272)". This means that all references in the *Thesaurus syr. Praktikē* go back to the heading of *this one particular letter* of Mar Aba; thus the generalized definition "with 'grt' a synodical letter" (Payne Smith, *A compendious Syriac dictionary*) is not applicable. Is this also a display of Mar Aba's knowledge of Greek? "*Praktikē*": "how to proceed".

his situation and how much precautions had to be taken to ensure that after his death, under whatever circumstances, irregular elections would not be held again and the institutional unity that had been painstakingly established would fall apart again. The regulations are therefore anything but provisional, but provide for a precise procedure to be followed, which was also to be used under normal circumstances.

The election is to take place through certain bishops in the "cities" and, in agreement with them, the ordination in the Church of Kōkē, "according to the tradition of the holy fathers"; the chosen one is installed on the "catholic throne" to take Mar Abas' place after his death. All this is determined "by the word of our Lord". An appointment made elsewhere than in *the great church of Kōkē* is invalid.

Canons of Mar Aba, "the patriarch, and the bishops with him" (Synodicon Orientale, 555-561). The sources for this collection are mentioned at the beginning, first western synods, including, interestingly, Chalcedon; then eastern ones: the Synod of the East in Seleucia-Ktesiphon under the Catholicos Isaac (= of the year 410) and the Synod of St. [31] Mar Aba himself. It can hardly be a coincidence that the title "patriarch" is not attributed to Isaac here, that no backward projection is made.

The canons deal with the everyday life of Christians, their communities and their priests. Of the higher hierarchical ranks above the bishop, we find the archbishop in c. XIII, metropolitans in cc. XIX and 37115; in c. 37 also the patriarch (the metropolitan has to send the newly ordained bishop to the patriarch so that he may confirm him). C. XXXIX stipulates that even censures that appear unjust are to be observed by all hierarchical ranks (e.g. a censure of a metropolitan by the patriarch) until the matter is clarified in the "general assembly" at the request of the censured person. The title *Katholikos* does not appear in the canons.

3.1 Summary

A review of the documents has confirmed Fiey's observation that the title patriarch has only been firmly established for the bishop of Seleukia-Ktesiphon as the chief metropolitan of the Persian church since Mar Aba, while retaining the older title catholic. In addition, the development of a certain topicality by Mar Aba could be established. That the adoption of the title in analogy to Western usage

115 Chabot normally gives Roman numerals for the Syriac and, in brackets, Arabic numerals for the Arabic transmission of these canons (CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 556 note 2). For c. 29-37 the Syriac text is missing (op. cit., 559 note 4), hence only the Arabic numerals.

(i.e. above all to the one in Antioch) and under its influence had to be postulated; the prerequisite is the equal status of the seats of Seleucia and Antioch, as it resulted from the minutes of the Synod of 410.

Transitional stages for the use of the title could be identified: the flattery of Barsauma towards Acacius; Kosmas Indikopleustes, who only knows the title *episkopos katholikos* for Mar Aba; the renunciation of the new title towards the high clergy in the remote Segestan, for whom "western" analogies could not mean much. The use of the title in the synodal minutes of 497 is probably a later entry; Babai's successor was not given the title "patriarch" in 540/544 in retrospect.

The analogy to the "Western" patriarchs is clearly expressed later in Išoyahb I, in c. 29 of the Synod of 585 (the entire canon is a treatise on the hierarchical structure of the Church): "The Holy Spirit <...> placed a four patriarchs in the territory of the West <...> and a fifth in the territory of the East" ¹¹⁶ - here we have the pentarchy from the [32] East Syriac point of view. Unfortunately, Išoyahb does not say which are the four western patriarchates - Rome, Alexandria, Antioch certainly, but Constantinople or Jerusalem? Even the Twelve (apostles) are appointed as patriarchs by Christ himself ¹¹⁷, which means that they occupy the "absolute" highest rank, "i.e. catholic ¹¹⁸ and paternal" ¹¹⁹. The hierarchical hierarchy is therefore divinely instituted, as old as the Church itself.

4 The minutes of the Synod of 424

The Synod of 424 ¹²⁰, which deals with the reinstitution of the Catholicos Dadišo', draws a parallel to his fate in the story of Mar Papa ¹²¹, who had been bishop of Seleukia a hundred years earlier ¹²², before the great persecution. There is an entire correspondence under Papa's name that must also be taken into account ¹²³.

If we apply Fiey's observation about the emergence of the title *katholikos* to both groups of texts, we must first note that the term

¹¹⁶ CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 160.7-11/419-420.

¹¹⁷ See also FIEV, *Jalons* (see note 1), 69 note 17.

¹¹⁸ Adverb derived from the title *Katholikos*! The explanation refers to the adverb *kln'yt*, "absolute".

¹¹⁹ CHABOT, *Synodicon* (as note 5), 159,28/419. Peter is not mentioned here, but CHABOT, *Synodicon* (as note 5), 160,15-16/420 is mentioned alongside Paul in connection with the statements about the fifth

Patriarchy.

¹²⁰ CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 258-298.

¹²¹ CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 289 below-292.

¹²² See below for the dating problems.

¹²³ See section 5 below.

of Mar Papa as Catholicos is a backward projection of the 5th (and 6th) century and therefore anachronistic. It is not possible to decide whether in these texts "Katholikos" replaces the title "bishop" for Papa, or whether the title was simply added to the name from the perspective of a later period. It seems worth mentioning that the title does not have the original and complete form *episkopos katholikos* anywhere, neither in the records nor in the correspondence.

If the title Katholikos is already anachronistic for Mar Papa, then this applies *a fortiori* to the title Patriarch, not only for Papa, but for all persons who are so named in the two literary complexes, both of which want to be contemporary, since these persons all belong to the 4th and early 5th centuries. The mere deletion of the title, as recommended by Fiey, is, as already mentioned, not enough; the "non-negotiability" ("nous devons être intraitables" 124) [33] he recommends in matters of the title will, however, prove to be very useful for the evaluation of parts of texts or entire texts.

Before I discuss the "patriarchal" elements of the Acts of 424 and Papa's Correspondence, taking into account the *topoi* identified above in Mar Aba, reference can be made to S. Gero's essay of 1982¹²⁵, which identifies "Petrine" elements in the Acts of 424, which are assigned with good reason to an eighth-century editing. Gero speaks of an "introduction of the argument of a specifically Petrine primacy" ¹²⁶ (incidentally, this argument is not found in the "Correspondence of Papa"). I will demonstrate here in detail how well the additions can be separated out: The Synod of 424 opens with the request of the assembled bishops¹²⁷ that Dadišo' should nevertheless return to his seat, "de se remettre à la tête de l'Église de Dieu, de reprendre la direction de la bergerie du Christ, dans tous les pays de l'Orient, qui *lui a été confiée* par (Chabot: dans) le Christ, par le sacerdoce suprême qu'il a reçu, *comme à Pierre*, le chef des Apôtres" ¹²⁸. This comparison works syntactically, it can be deleted without difficulty. In the letter of the "Western" Fathers, which is read out by Bishop Agapet at the synod and which Labourt declares to be "well understood apocryphal" ¹²⁹ (more on this below), a Petrine argument appears a second time among the reasons why the Church (of the East) should only have *one* leader¹³⁰.

124 See note 35 above.

125 S. GERO, The see of Peter in Babyton: Western influences on the ecclesiology of early Eastern Christianity, in: N. G. GARSOIAN/TH. F. MATHEWS/R. W. Thomson (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the formative period*, Dumbarton Oaks 1982, 45-51. Gero notes p. 48 Fiey's judgment on the anachronistic use of the title "patriarch" in the Acts of 424.

126 GERO, The see of Peter (see note 125), 48 f.

127 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 286 above.

128 Literally: "comme au chef des Apôtres, Pierre", CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 44.5.

129 LABOURT, Le christianisme (see note 8), 21 note 1.

130 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 292 above/syr. 48,7-15.

Et de même que le Père de vérité est un, que son Fils, le Christ sauveur, est un, que son Esprit vivant et consolateur est un: de même, le Fils ne s'est choisi qu'un seul intendant fidèle, *Simon Bar Yôna*, surnommé *Pierre*, à qui il a fait cette promesse: 'Sur cette pierre je bâtirai mon Église', et: 'Je te donnerai les clefs du royaume des cieux'; mais il n'a pas été dit par le Christ à tous les disciples: 'Sur vous je bâtirai', ni: 'Je vous donnerai'. Le don du sacerdoce a été concédé à tous les Apôtres, mais le principat unique, c'est-à-dire la paternité¹³¹ spirituelle, n'a pas été donné à tous¹³²; et, pour un seul Dieu véritable, il [34] n'y a aussi qu'un seul économe fidèle, qui est le chef, le directeur et le procureur de ses frères.

This entire section can also be detached from the context without disturbing its cohesion and thus recognized as an interpolation. The observation that interpolations only become recognizable as such at the end proves itself again here. The Petrine insertion is preceded by¹³³ examples of irreversible subordination: children - parents; wives - husbands; and in cases where the men obeyed the women, they had incurred punishments because they did not obey them.

"les constitutions et les lois placées par Dieu dans la nature"; it is fitting that every perfection (i.e. also in this respect) should be found all the more in the church. And after the insertion, it continues: "Ces lois et ces constitutions sont observées dans notre Église", without any reference to the interlude. A third opportunity for Petrine accentuation is the end of Agapet's speech, where he returns to the occasion of the synod after his long remarks about Papa, Isaac and Yahbalaha. There are two small interpolations¹³⁴ here, but one of them is very striking. The title and name of Dadišo' is preceded by a series of appositions ("notre directeur, notre dispensateur <...>" etc.), followed by the explanation (Synodicon Orientale, syr. 50,2): "who is (identification formula *hwyw*) for us Peter"; the following "head of our ecclesiastical assembly" could again belong to the original. At the end of the passage is added (Synodicon Orientale, syr. 50,6 f.): "according to the commandment of Christ to the head of the apostles, Peter".

Gero then goes even further, however, by declaring the "declaration of total independence from the western 'patriarchs'" to be "more congruent with circumstances of the eighth century" than with those of the 420s¹³⁵ : i.e. that he would like to attribute it to the same hand as the Petrine insertions.

Until recently, however, the minutes of the Synod of 424 have been used to document the emancipation of the Persian Church from the Patriarchate of Antioch and the introduction of the title of patriarch even before the period of Christological controversy.

¹³¹ In this context, "paternity" is certainly an allusion to patriarchal dignity.

¹³² Cf. on the other hand the view of Išo'yahb I at the Synod of 585 in c. 29: the apostles as patriarchs and the apostles as patriarchs. of Christ (already quoted above).

¹³³ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 291 below.

¹³⁴ In the section that begins in CHABOT, Synodicon (as note 5), 294 with "And now <...>".

¹³⁵ GERO, The see of Peter (see note 125), 49.

considered to be of great importance. Thus Joseph Feghali in 1979 in the *Melanges Dauvillier*¹³⁶: The bishop of Seleukia-Ktesiphon "a été reconnu[e] avec des pouvoirs étendus par le patriarche d'Antioche, [35] avec le titre de catholicos. Puis, alors que le catholicos Dadišo' avait été contesté et peut-être pour répondre au reproche secret que les chrétiens étaient les alliés des Romains, le synode de 424 proclame que leur chef sera désormais indépen- dant et ne pourra être jugé que par le Christ; et il ajoute au titre de catholicos celui de patriarche. Et ainsi, cette église, qui s'intitulait 'Église orientale' se sépare du patriarcat d'Antioche et par là même de l'Église universelle¹³⁷. La rupture sera totale après l'adop- tion des doctrines condamnées par le concile d'Éphèse et soutenues par Nestorius". The observations made by Fiey as early as 1967/1970 and the conclusions he drew from them are unknown to Feghali; in Fiey we read¹³⁸: "Si, comme il est vraisemblable, les Églises de Perse n'eurent jamais que des liens très lâches avec les autres Églises, et notamment avec Antioche, le problème de leur émancipation serait un faux problème, et il serait inutile de lui chercher une occasion."

A completely different aspect of this synod is important to Joseph Habbi; in 1994 Habbi argued for the "structure patriarcale de l'église "¹³⁹. "Afin de corroborer historiquement cette idée, on peut invoquer deux exemples <...> je parle des deux Patriarcats-Catholi- cats, celui de l'Orient de Séleucie-Ctésiphon Mésopotamien et le Arménien", "ces deux Patriarcats <...> reflètent le mieux la réalité des premières communautés chrétiennes, à cause de leur isolement obligatoire, pour des raisons politiques "¹⁴⁰. Habbi first cites the position of the Catholicos Isaac from the Synod of 410¹⁴¹. He then collects some patriarchal and Petrine statements from the Synod of 424 and summarizes: "Chaque Catholicos ou Patriarche est chef suprême, père et Pierre de son église autonome. "¹⁴² Here, too, there is no knowledge of Fiey and Gero's work, which is now available, but a completely different attitude to the independence of the Persian church than in Feghali, which undoubtedly reflects the authors' different ecclesiastical denominations.

Both Feghali and Habbi read the text of 424 as if doubts about the integrity of precisely this synodal protocol had not already been expressed many decades before the more recent investigations, namely by Labourt in his well-known standard work of 1904 (and by [36] Westphal in 1901)¹⁴³.

¹³⁶ J. FEGHALI, Perspectives sur l'histoire et l'institution des patriarches orientaux, in: *Mélanges Jean Dauvillier*, Toulouse 1979, 269-292; here 281, my emphasis.

¹³⁷ So is the *église universelle* only the one on the soil of the Roman Empire?

¹³⁸ FIEV, *Jalons* (see note 1), 82, my emphasis.

¹³⁹ J. HABBI, La structure patriarcale de l'église, in: R. Coppola (ed.), *Atti del congresso internazionale Incontro fra Canonici d'Oriente e d'Occidente*, Bari 1994, 157-182.

¹⁴⁰ HABBI, La structure (see note 139), 179.

¹⁴¹ HABBI, La structure (see note 139), 180.

¹⁴² HABBI, La structure (see note 139), 181.

¹⁴³ G. Westphal's title in LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8) in the bibliography, p. XVIII: *Investigations into the sources and credibility of the patriarchal chronicles of Mari ibn Su-*

the Synod according to the acts¹⁴⁴, but writes in a note¹⁴⁵: "§ 1 Je ne puis me défendre de concevoir des doutes assez graves sur l'authenticité des actes de Dadišo' (Syn. orient., p. 285-299), au moins en ce qui concerne la partie où sont rapportées les allocutions des métropolitains Agapit et Osée, ainsi que l'histoire de Papa et de Milès. § 2 Ces doutes sont partagés par M. Westphal (op. cit., p. 162), qui trouve les discours composés sur un plan bien artificiel. § 3 Ils sont fortifiés par la considération du singulier parallélisme qui existe entre la situation de Iahbalaha et de Ma'na, telle qu'elle ressort du texte de Mare que nous avons rapporté plus haut (p. 103, n. 1), et celle de Papa et de Milès. § 4 Papa et Iahbalaha sont évêques de Séleucie; Ma'na et Milès, évêques de Perse. § 5 Ma'na et Milès font, en synode, des remontrances à Iahbalaha et à Papa. § 6 Pour avoir dédaigné ces observations, l'évêque de Séleucie est, dans les deux cas, foudroyé par un mal subit. § 7 Il fait appel, dans les deux cas, aux 'Pères occidentaux' (Acace d'Amid¹⁴⁶). § 8 Les Pères occidentaux déposent les adversaires de Papa. § 9 De même les évêques dont nous avons rapporté les noms (p. 120, n. 7) ont été déposés par Iahbalaha et Acace, puis de nouveau par Dadišo' (et Acace?).

§ 10 Est-il téméraire de penser que Dadišo', pour les besoins de sa cause, favorisa l'éclosion d'une littérature apocryphe, et en fit lire un résumé dans le synode de 424? § 11 Autre coïncidence, non moins singulière: D'après le *Briefwechsel des Katholikos Papa*, édité par M. Braun, et la 'lettre des occidentaux' publiée par 'Abdišo' (Coll. can, Tr. IX, ch. v), la missive est apportée aux orientaux par Ḥabib-Agapet, et dans le *Synodicon*, c'est Agapit de Beit Lapat, qui est censé défendre, en vertu des décisions antérieures des 'directeurs de l'Occident', la primauté du siège de Séleucie. § 12 The question is, cependant, loin d'être tirée au clair. § 13 Si Dadišo' invoque la décision des Occidentaux intervenue en faveur de son prédécesseur Iahbalaha, pourquoi fait-il interdire, par les évêques de son synode, tout recours ultérieur à ces mêmes Occidentaux et décider qu'on ne pourra en appeler du tribunal du catholicos qu'à celui de [37] Dieu meme?" This last sentence also includes the synodal decision in the group of suspicious elements of the acts¹⁴⁷. Labort's consideration in § 10 that Dadišo' was behind the apocryphal literature

laiman, 'Amr ibn Matai and Saliba ibn Johannan. Thèse de doctorat de Strasbourg 1901 (not consulted by me). In GERO, The see of Peter (see note 125), 38, the place of publication is given: Kirchhayn N.-L. (it is certainly a private printing). References to the works of Westphal, Labourt and Fiey in GERO, op. cit. 48.

144 LABOURT, Le christianisme (see note 8), 119-125.

145 LABOURT, Le christianisme (see note 8), 125 note 1. I insert §-figures to make it easier to read. to be able to discuss them.

146 This can only refer to the case of Jahbalaha.

147 W. HAGE, Das orientalische Christentum, RM 29,2, Stuttgart 2007 (the volume is an admirable (l.c., 275 above), also still assumes the authenticity of the synodal decision of 424, but for him the autocephaly of the church in the Persian Empire is self-evident. I would also take the liberty of complaining that Hage is not convinced by the "separation Christology" of the Antiochians and "Nestorians" (op. cit., 32 and 465), the correct term is "discernment Christology".

which is reflected in the speeches given at the Synod, can be left aside¹⁴⁸ : not only does the character of the Catholicos speak against it, as expressed in his own account of his fate and in his thoroughly serious resistance to his reinstitution, but above all the criterion to which Fiey has drawn our attention, the use of the title of patriarch.

Chabot's comment on the first appearance of Agapet at the synod of 424 should be compared with § 11 of the quotation from Labourt¹⁴⁹: "Agapit, év. de Beit Lapat, le même, semble-t-il, qui avait d'abord été reprouvé¹⁵⁰ dans le synode d'Isaac (cf. ci-dessus, p. 271) et qui assista au synode de Yahbalaha (cf. p. 283). According to 'Ébedjésus (Coll. can., Tr. IV, chap. v) la prétendue lettre des évêques occidentaux aurait été apportée au catholicos de Séleucie par cet Agapit, ce qui aurait valu à son siège l'honneur du premier rang. Mais cette légende est en contradiction avec les actes du synode d'Isaac qui présentent Agapit comme révolté¹⁵¹". It is easy to see that the alleged delivery of the alleged western letter by Agapet is spun out of the introduction to Agapet's speech at the synod¹⁵²: Agapet rises and asks for permission "*de lire les lettres canoniques, qui furent envoyées en divers temps par les directeurs de l'Occident vers nos anciens Pères, et en dernier lieu du temps des catholicos Mar Isaac et Mar Yahbalaha*" (i.e. in the time of Agapet himself). As far as Chabot's references are concerned, p. 283 of the *Synodicon Orientale* contains the signatures of the Synod of 420, where Agapet is listed in an unchallenged and prominent position, namely as the first after the Catholicos and Acacius, followed (as in 424) by Hosea of Nisibis.

[38] Chabot's objection that Agapet was a "révolté" and therefore could not have played the role of a messenger can be corrected from Chabot's reference back to p. 271 of the *Synodicon Orientale* to his own "réprouvé" and thus refuted; here it is a matter of c. XXI of the Synod of 410, where we read: "Le trouble et la confusion règnent dans certains pays où se trouvent des villes dont les évêques ont été destitués et rejetés". This is followed by a sentence that is mutilated in both editions of the *Synodicon Orientale*, but in which the name of Agapet is found among the bishops listed. Chabot's excellent explanation; "En comparant les deux textes" (i.e. of the two Hss.) "avec la suite de canon, on voit clairement qu'il s'agit du trouble excité

148 Another reference by Labourt (see LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 21 note 1) and Fieys (FIEV, *Jalons* (see note 1), 73 note 34) to a connection between the Catholicos Joseph, the successor of Mar Aba, i.e. 6th century, and the "correspondence of the Catholicos Papa" - a connection that goes back to a remark in Barhebräus - has a greater chance of containing a kernel of truth.

149 CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 289 note 2.

150 My emphasis.

151 My emphasis.

152 CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 289 center.

dans le Beit Houzayé par la présence simultanée de plusieurs évêques dans une même ville, occasionnée surtout, à ce qu'il semble, par la compétition au titre de métropo- litain des évêques de Beit Lapat et de Karka de Lêdan, chacun d'eux ayant sans doute ordonné un évêque de son parti dans les différents sièges". The fact that this contest had turned out in Agapet's favor and that he had thus become a member of the legitimate hierarchy is clear from his position on the list in 420 as well as in 424; thus one could plausibly attribute alleged actions to the real important prelate. As far as I can see, no one has yet doubted the fact of the synod of 424 as such, nor its actual occasion, the reinstatement of Catholicos Dadišo'. The following assumes that there was a written record of the synodal negotiation, i.e. an original text. What we have now is a considerable expansion of the original. It is difficult to decide whether any of the "original text" was lost during this extensive editing; however, all the important steps up to Dadišo's renewed assumption of leadership of the Church are recorded. I am now trying to distinguish between the original and the later inserted sections of the acts with the help of a scheme of capital and small letters; sometimes the distinction is uncertain. The printed arrangement of Chabot's translation reflects the natural organization of the text; in very few cases I have subdivided it even further.

Synodicon Orientale, p. 285 (a) Editor of the Synodicon, lemma153: "Assemblée des metropolitains <...>"

(B) Time and place information154: "En la 4^e année de Waran <...>" and list of parts takers.

p. 286 (C) and (c): Object of the Synod155: "Tous ces évêques présentèrent une supplique <...>." [39] We know the idea that the highest office was entrusted to the Catholicos through Christ (not "in Christ" as in Chabot) from the patriarchal theology of Mar Aba. This is also the first "Petrine" addition, "comme à Pierre, le chef des Apôtres".

pp. 286-287 (d) The Supplik156: "De l'accord (dirent-ils) et de l'avis des saints <...>". The section is almost entirely filled with the later patriarchal ideology: "<...> le don du patriarcat a été donné et confirmé à ce siège béni qui est dans la grande église de Kōkē <...> De ton siège (ce don) s'est propagé et répandu sur tous les sièges épiscopaux <...> et il se propage et se répand encore sans interruption", no sovereign intervention can interrupt this course. In any case, this cannot be the original supplication.

153 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 43,1-5.

154 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 43,9-20.

155 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 44,1-5.

156 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 44,5-14.

p. 287 (e) or (E): Introduction to Dadišo'157's speech: "Après que ces choses eurent été dites par nous <...>", the "famous confessor" spoke "to our assembly."

pp. 287-289 (F) Speech of Dadišo'158: "Les réprouvés qui sont parmi nous <...>". It there is no reason to deny this speech to Dadišo'. The emotion at the end of the speech is genuine¹⁵⁹ (Synodicon Orientale, 289):

"And now, why are you tired of my afflicted body, which is sad beyond measure because of the multitude of tribulations that have befallen it? For your honor modeste, I have suffered a great affront and an affliction démesurée. Let me be afflicted by the pleas about the ruins of the church, about the humiliation and the loss of her children". He said these things, and his eyes répandaient des larmes; he pleurait dans sa douleur et fit pleurer tous les évêques.

The later short speech with which Dadišo' will give in to the Supplication in the further course of the Synod (p. 297 (R) see below) is delivered in the same tone of pain and bitterness and is just as genuine.

p. 289-294¹⁶⁰ (g) Speech of Agapet with inclusion of the "Letter of the Western Fathers" (h) (Synodicon Orientale, 291-292)¹⁶¹: "Alors l'évêque Agapit se leva <...>". At the beginning it is a discourse on this speech (Synodicon Orientale, 289)¹⁶²: "Agapit lut les lettres, et continua à parler successivement des premiers troubles <...>", beginning with the story of Papa. It is not possible to tell when the speech switches to direct speech. Chabot does not even use quotation marks here; he only includes the letter mentioned in the signs. Agapit refers to the papa [40] as "patriarch" (Synodicon Orientale, 291 above). The "Western Fathers" determine in their letter that Papa should resume the "patriarchal regiment"; at this point follows the larger "Petrine" insertion (Synodicon Orientale, 292)¹⁶³. The letter of the "Western Fathers" concludes with a sentence in "patriarchal" language, the content of which must have been particularly important to the author of the late parts of the Acts (Synodicon Orientale, 292)¹⁶⁴: "Et de même dans la région orientale, dans le siège patriarcal établi dans la ville de Séleucie, dans la grande église de Kōkē, les évêques ne peuvent tenir une assemblée contre leur chef et leur maître, car ils n'ont point le pouvoir de se faire ses juges; qu'ils sachent qu'ils n'ont pas le droit d'étendre la main sur ce qui ne leur a été donné ni par Dieu ni par les hommes".

¹⁵⁷ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 44,15-16.

¹⁵⁸ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 44,17-46,8.

¹⁵⁹ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 46,3-8.

¹⁶⁰ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 46,9-50,7.

¹⁶¹ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 47,20-48,27.

¹⁶² CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 46,14.

¹⁶³ See above.

¹⁶⁴ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 48,22-27.

p. 292 below¹⁶⁵ (i) Agapet's concluding remark about Papa, therein¹⁶⁶: <...> the letters from the West "étaient confirmés par l'autorité de la parole de Dieu".

pp. 292-293¹⁶⁷ (j) Agapet further: on the Catholicos Isaac.

P. 293¹⁶⁸ (k) Agapet further: on the Katholikos Yahbalaha.

pp. 293-294 line 5 from bottom (l)¹⁶⁹, begins a summary of the whole speech with direct address to the assembled: "Vous le savez, ô nos Pères <...>", when schism and disunity prevailed among us, the western fathers were the support "de cette Paternité"¹⁷⁰ to which we are all connected, like the limbs to the head.

p. 294 (m) (and M?)¹⁷¹: "And now <...>": one expects that Dadišo' will now be implored to resume his leadership - this happens, but only after a good third of the section, beginning with the words¹⁷² "Venez, cicatrisons les blessures de notre peuple <...>". Before that, however, it is explained why it is *now* necessary to act without Western help: "Et maintenant que la persécution et l'angoisse se sont tellement appesanties sur nous, le temps ne leur permet [41] pas de s'occuper de nous comme auparavant". We must make an effort ourselves and help each other through the authority that is superior to us, without which we are lost. In response to the assertion that "now" Western help was impossible, Labort rightly remarked¹⁷³:

"Comment concilier cette assertion avec le fait, récent encore, de l'intervention des Romains dans le traité de paix qui mit fin à la période aiguë de la persécution de Bahrām? Acace d'Amid, who had already been delegated to the synod of Iahbalaba, sought to gain the faith of the king of Perse for the Christians by avenging, at the price of the sacred vases of his church, sept mille prisonniers <...> and returning them to their sovereign <...>.

<Acace> se trouvait donc probablement à la Porte Royale tandis que Dadišo' tenait son concile <...>". Labourt considers the assertion of the now impossible Western aid to be a pretext of Dadišo' - so in his plain text under the assumption of the complete authenticity of the files; we have seen from the accompanying note, however, that this assumption seems contestable to Labourt himself. The discrepancy he identified is therefore attributable to the author of the later parts of the file.

¹⁶⁵ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 48,27-30.

¹⁶⁶ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 48,28-29.

¹⁶⁷ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 48,30-49,12.

¹⁶⁸ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 49,12-22.

¹⁶⁹ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 49,22-27.

¹⁷⁰ Here, "paternity" (or "fatherhood", as O. Braun translates it, see below) is the patriarchal Topik, within which the vocabulary for "patriarch" or "patriarchal dignity" can occur or alludes to it. Of course, the application to a catholicos can be found even before this, see the case of Jahbalaha, Synod of 420, CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 277. Did an editing hand replace another attribute with it?

¹⁷¹ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 49,27-50,7.

¹⁷² CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 49,31.

¹⁷³ LABOURT, Le christianisme (see note 8), 124.

and is an indication of its inauthenticity. What kind of "now" does this author imagine?

On p. 294 in the main part of section (m), which begins, as already mentioned, with "Venez, cicatrisons <...>", a call is made to sacrifice oneself for the Catholicos; this title is accompanied by a series of appositae of leadership, including "Father", as has often been the case. One of the "Petrine" additions is again inserted into the appositae. The *Katholikos* as "notre dispensateur, le distributeur de toutes les richesses des trésors divins" is a motif that we know from Mar Aba. The renewed request that the refuser accept the supplication of his bishops is accompanied by the announcement that this request would be further emphasized by demonstrating "mourning, sackcloth and ashes, weeping and lamenting" "at his gate", i.e. the bishops would plead for his compliance in the manner of public church penance.

This latter announcement could also have been made at the actual meeting, as all means were obviously needed to persuade the deeply wounded man. When the "return to his *paternal* chair and the resumption of his reign over us" is then mentioned, this is probably part of the "patriarchal" way of speaking ("paternal" of course means "as father"). This is followed by the last of the "Petrine" additions.

[42] pp. 294-295¹⁷⁴ (n) or (N)? "Après que ces choses eurent été dites <...>", follows a short address to the congregation by Bishop Hosea of Nisibis.

Incidentally, there is nothing to suggest that at the Synod of 424, as it actually took place, the two bishops Agapet and Hosea took the floor. Agapet certainly did not give the speech as we read it today, and we cannot be completely sure about Hosea's speech, as it takes up motifs from Dadišo's speech.

Hosea calls on his colleagues to react and abandon the state of silent confusion. Let us do the obvious (we do not need to go to the gate¹⁷⁵ of the true head of the church - far away from the meeting place), let us take hold of his feet with our hands!

p. 295¹⁷⁶ (O) "Tous les évêques se levèrent alors et se prosternèrent <...>".

Note how much text follows before Dadišo' asks those in front of him to rise: he does so only in section (R), p. 297.

The bishops tearfully address a supplication to Dadišo', in which they beg him for forgiveness; he should not turn his face away from his church, they agree with or even demand the punishment of those who have offended the Catholicos. Towards the end, he is addressed as "Ta Paternité".

174 CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), syr. 50,7-20.

175 Cf. above, at the end of Agapet's speech, the "gate" of Dadišo', before which the penitents are to be want to enter.

176 CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), syr. 50,21-51,3.

There is nothing to suggest that this supplement is not genuine, with the possible exception of this salutation.

p. 295-297¹⁷⁷ (p) "Et nous avons accepté <...>". This is followed by the Supplik (without any director's note in between¹⁷⁸) a subsequent construction of the course of relations between the Orientals and the Occidentals on the basis of patriarchal ideology. The historically untenable thesis of the separation of the Church of the East from the Western Church in the year 424 is based on this account. The passage presents itself as a resolution of the Synod: we have accepted the "divine commandments and paternal laws sent from time to time to this Eastern region", to the effect that he who is Father must not be driven out of his Church (cf. the letter of the "Western Fathers" in the Agapet's speech!). A western provision is communicated (p. 296 above¹⁷⁹)¹⁸⁰ which states that the bishops may not organize a synod against their head, may not write a writ of complaint against him, "but if they have to complain and no satisfaction is made to them at the synod in his presence, they may refer it to the patriarchs,

¹⁷⁷ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 51,4-52,3.

¹⁷⁸ Chabot's translation has only one dash between sections (O) and (p).

¹⁷⁹ CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 51,8-12.

¹⁸⁰ [43]On this passage, CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 296 note 1: "Le passage suivant est cité par 'Ébedjésus (Coll. can., Tr. IX, chap. v; Mai, p. 163) sous la rubrique: *Occidentales*; mais il n'a pas compris ou il altère le sens exact, en attribuant aux Occidentaux les paroles mêmes de ce synode et la définition par laquelle on interdit de faire appel des décisions du patriarche de Seleucie à celui d'Antioche" (note that the place names of Chabot are inserted interpretatively!). The passage in Ebedjesus is quoted in Latin from Assemani, Bibliotheca Orientalis III 56 by O. Braun at the end of his German translation of the "Briefwechsel des Katholikos Papa", ZKTh 18, 1894, 182. Alex. Schilling copied the Syriac text from Assemani for me. Incidentally, Braun considers the passage to be a quotation (he probably means: from the part that has not survived) of ep. VIII of the "correspondence"; but in fact it is a tendentious summary of a passage from the (alleged) synodal decision of 424.

"Ebedjesus: *Occidentales*. Quod autem a Patribus nostris spiritualibus dictum est, *Judicium videlicet Patriarchae Orientis nostris Patriarchis esse reservatum*; quia habita exacta inquisitione compertum fuit, Patriarchae accusatores in suis delationibus fuisse falsitatis convictos, et Patriarchas illatorum criminum omnino immunes: *nunc* definimus in potestate et verba vivo Dei, nullum deinceps habere jus Metropolitae et Episcopos, sed nec Christianos Orientis, ad accusationes criminationesve instruendas adversus proprium Patriarchem, easque ad Patres nostros Occidentales verba aut scripto deferendas. Quodsi rursus aliud quidpiam objiciant, sicut hactenus fecerunt, ipsis respondemus: Patriarcham omnium Christianorum Orientis esse judicem; ipsius autem Patriarchae judicem esse Christum." What may have prompted Ebedjesus (or one of his sources?) to make the historically untenable claim that the judgment of the patriarch of the East was *r e s e r v e d* for the "Western" patriarchs (a situation that should be changed "now")? Rather, the text of 424 lays down a *general* rule (CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 296 above) (which, incidentally, presupposes the equality of all patriarchs), which Ebedjesus obviously wants to apply to the specific case - a completely unsuccessful *applicatio*.

his colleagues, who will distinguish between him and them after they have examined the matter".

Where is there such a "Western" rule? Chabot has no comment on this assertion of the text.

"But we "181 ("comme maintes fois <...>" - Chabot continues after a comma continues by slightly rearranging the long sentence) "<...> now determine by the word of God¹⁸²: Que les Orientaux ne pourront se plaindre devant les patriarches occidentaux de leur patriarche. Que toute cause qui ne pourra être résolue en présence de celui-ci soit réservée au tribunal du Christ".

A text that speaks here and above of "patriarchs" in the plural can only have been written at a time when it was completely customary to speak of [44] the chief bishops in the Roman Empire as "patriarchs", i.e. decades or even more than 100 years after the Synod of 424.

No synod may be held against the Catholicos, no writ of complaint against him, etc., as happened in earlier cases, especially in the case of Papa. "Pour aucun motif on ne pourra penser ou dire que le catholicos de l'Orient peut être jugé par ceux qui sont au-dessous de lui, ou par un patriarche comme lui". "We bishops all, like all those who will come after us, agree and give our approbation, absent and present, to all that your paternity will do and all the fathers (will do) who will come after us and will hold your throne".

p. 297¹⁸³ (Q) "The bishops added and said: Long live the Lord and long live You yourself, our Father! We will not let go of your feet and will not rise from the earth until you give peace to our present assembly and to the whole Church".

p. 297 (R)¹⁸⁴ The speech of Dadišo'; I have already referred to its character above. pointed out. The bishops respond with Amen.

(s)¹⁸⁵ The bishops confirm once again what they have defined "in agreement with you, our Father" - since these provisions are all contained in the late parts of the Acts, (s) can also be attributed to this layer. As is often the case in the text, the incantation "by the living word of the Trinity" appears here once again.

p. 297-298¹⁸⁶ (t) or first the editor of the Synodicon: Über die Unterschriften, die were previously included in the text and are not specifically mentioned here.

181 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 51,12.

182 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 296 note 2: "Tout ce qui suit est cité à peu près textuellement par 'Ébedjésus loc. cit.'" (see the penultimate note) "Mai p. 164".

183 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 52,4-6.

184 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 52,7-16.

185 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 52,17-27.

186 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), syr. 52,29-53,2.

The following observations must be made on sections (g), History of Papa, and the letter of the "Western Fathers" (h) included therein in Agapet's speech. These texts must, of course, take into account that the two opponents of Papa, Miles (bishop of Susa)¹⁸⁷ and Simeon (Baršabba'e, counter-bishop and successor), were famous martyrs of the great persecution. They could therefore not be portrayed as rebels themselves, but as having been seduced by the rebellious bishops because of their simplicity, ignorance and credulity, while they themselves were virtuous. The rebels wanted to act as accusers and witnesses against Papa, while Miles and the virtuous bishops like him were to be judges. Although they had *no right* to act as judges, they pronounced Papa's deposition. The matter came to the ears of the "western fathers" (it is not said how), who investigate the invective against Papa and depose the rebels. Of the virtuous bishops who took part in the meeting against Papa¹⁸⁸, "some went out of this world honored by martyrdom", others died in good name, those still alive kept their position because they were considered naive and simple and therefore easy to dispose of. It was the western fathers who gave the papa his rights against the assembly of his disciples *who had no right to do so* (to convene such a synod) - this is the refrain (and the basic theme of the entire file complex in its present form).

The first sentence of the letter from the "Western Fathers" is a *vaticinium ex eventu*, which does not raise any great hopes in the trustworthiness of perhaps a basic tenet of the "Western Fathers".

187 LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), prints the dispute between Papa and Miles in the two surviving versions, first that from the files of 424, then that from the point of view of the other side from the files of St. Miles. Labourt remarks: "Ces deux versions ne sont ni l'une ni l'autre originales. Mais elles dépend d'une tradition commune qu'il n'y a pas lieu de suspecter". The comparison shows that the version of "424" makes a selection that is already tendentious as such. Even the scandalous scene in which Papa angrily strikes the Gospel book with the cry, [45] "Speak, Gospel, speak!" (for which he has to pay with paralysis), is framed differently.

188 On the problem of dating, see LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 26 note 1: "Je renonce. pour ma part, à essayer de déterminer la date de ces événements en coordonnant les renseignements fournis par des annalistes dont aucun n'est antérieur au XIIe siècle." Westphal in his dissertation believes that he can give the Synod of Papa the date 313/4, calculated in relation to the martyrdom of Simon and the news in the *Passio* of Miles that the bishop of Seleucia survived the paralysis attack for twelve years. But the Miles files are so tendentious that caution is called for. "À mon avis, il est impossible d'établir une chronologie solide pour les années qui ont précédé la persécution de Sapor II." On Papa in the chronicle of Arbela (which Labourt did not yet know), see W. SCHWAIGERT, *Miles and Papa: The Struggle for Primacy. A contribution to the discussion about the Chronik of Arbela*, in: V. Symposium Syriacum, Leuven 1988, OCA 236, 1990, 393-402.

of the text: Mar Papa will be given a place in the diptychs¹⁸⁹ above all his predecessors. The next sentence gives a canonically correct arrangement concerning the second prominent opponent; the motif of the seduced innocent is again recognizable: We know that Simeon, who was appointed in Papa's place, is a virtuous and godly man, whom the assembly had to compel by force [46]; he is to become Papa's archdeacon and, on Papa's death, his successor in the "patriarchal government". Now the archdeaconry in the Persian Church is attested for the first time in the canons of 410,190 and the question is whether it already existed at all in the "West" in the first quarter of the 4th century, so here too there is an anachronism in what can easily be recognized as a subsequent harmonization of annoying ecclesiastical conditions.

The acts of the Synod of 424 in their present form are therefore the product of a later period on the basis of an original basic inventory. Presumably this basic inventory was not much more extensive than it can now be ascertained with a certain degree of uncertainty. It is even conceivable that it was this small size that invited the large expansions in the first place. A *terminus a quo* can be given for the time of the expansion: the time of Mar Aba, because the patriarchal terminology developed by him is used. However, no one would think that Mar Aba was the producer of our text - he had other things to worry about. A good candidate, however, is the next catholicos, Joseph (552-567). He adopted the patriarchal language of his predecessor, as can be seen from the address of the acts of his synod of 554¹⁹¹:

Aux vénérables amis de Dieu, nos frères et collègues, les métropolitains et évêques des provinces de la région orientale, qui dans la vraie foi au Christ, sont en communion, *par l'institution paternelle, avec le trône apostolique qui est (fixé) en l'église de Kôké, dans les villes royales de Séleucie et Ctésiphon*¹⁹²; <...> Joseph <...> institué catholicos, patriarche <...> et <...> les évêques de la grande province du siège apostolique, patriarchal et paternel, établi dans la grande église de Kôké, à Séleucie et Ctésiphon <...>: Paix abondante <...>.

Joseph's rule of the church was so despotic¹⁹³ that the bishops complained and sent him a letter of complaint, which the Catholicos ignored. "A synod assembled and pronounced his deposition. He

189 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 291 translates "livre des vivants", more correctly "livre de vie", *terminus technicus* for diptych. On the *vaticinium* s. CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), *ibid.* note 2: "Cf. les diptyques publiés par Brightmann, Eastern Liturgies, p. 276".

190 Can. XV.

191 CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 95.13-22/352.

192 The following are just keywords from the full text.

193 Briefly in CHABOT, Synodicon (see note 5), 352, note 1; in detail LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (as note 8), 192-197 (i.e. the paragraph on Joseph, therein 194-195); Baumstark 124.

nevertheless continued with ordinations and carried out acts of patriarchal jurisdiction (Labort).¹⁹⁴ Finally the bishops turned to the Grand King for mediation. At a [47] new synod, the deposition was again pronounced and the catholicos was transferred to the lay state; the date is assumed to be the year 567¹⁹⁵.

Joseph, who had been appointed by the Great King, stood¹⁹⁶ even after that, however.

"si bien en cour qu'on n'osa pas lui choisir un successeur. Le patriarche déposé soutint sa cause avec une énergie bien conforme à sa caractère. Dès qu'il se sentit menacé, il rédigea divers écrits, tous destinés à affirmer la primauté absolue du siège de Séleucie et l'universelle et suprême juridiction de son titulaire". I also include in this antagonistic writing the additions to the original acts of the Synod of 424. What he writes there about the irremovability of the Catholicos and about the prohibition of writing accusations against him is intended to prove the deposition, which nevertheless happened to him by his suffragans, as illegal and directed against decisions that were (supposedly) of venerable age. One may wonder why he did not go back even further for his creative pursuits. But the isolation from the "West" and the dependence on his own solutions, which he claims for "now" (i.e. for *his* present and not that of the synod!), could not possibly be interpolated into acts of synods in which a "Western" bishop was not only present, but also actively involved in church-organizing measures of the synods, as in 410 and 420. However, the inclusion of Papa's story in Agapet's speech made it possible to go back even to the early 4th century. The dating of the interpolated overall text to the now distant year 424 finally attracted those late "Petrine" additions to which Gero drew attention. In passing, the transmission attributes to Joseph the compilation of a patriarchal catalog¹⁹⁷, "qui, sans doute, tendait à démontrer l'apostolicité du siège de Séleucie" Labourt surmises (what kind of "apostolicity" does he mean?).

More interesting for us is the appearance of his name in connection with the apocryphal "Correspondence of the Catholicos Papa". "Il augmenta du moins ce dossier dont certaines pièces existaient avant lui" (Labourt)¹⁹⁸. To use a fashionable expression: a literary "initial suspicion" arises against Joseph (see the following section).

¹⁹⁴ LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 195-196.

¹⁹⁵ CHABOT, *Synodicon* (see note 5), 352 note 1: "Il est regardé comme illégitime et son nom est omis dans certaines listes patriarcales."

¹⁹⁶ LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 196-197.

¹⁹⁷ LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 197 with note 1. This communication in Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* III, p. 435. The tradent is Elie Djauhari, in BAUMSTARK, p. 124 n. 7 (in a different spelling).

¹⁹⁸ LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 197.

[48]5 The "correspondence of Katholikos Papa" and the special position of ep. VIII

Of the literary and historical problems of the "Briefwechsel des Katholikos Papa" Labourt says twice: "La question est, cependant, loin d'être tirée au clair"¹⁹⁹. It is not the intention here to achieve complete clarity, but rather, by applying Fiey's criterion of the use of the patriarchal title and by extending the criterion to the patriarchal topic developed by Mar Aba and adopted by Joseph, to work out the anachronistic features even more clearly. This has a certain significance because a passage from ep. VIII ("Letter of the Western Fathers") was included in the canonical collection of Ebedjesu.

O. Braun presented a German translation of the correspondence in 1894 and added an investigation²⁰⁰ which Labort evaluated with a sharper assessment of the question of authenticity²⁰¹. But even Baumstark²⁰² (although he must have been aware of Labourt's doubts about Agapet's speech) deduces from the reading of a letter from the "Western Fathers" to Papa at the Synod of 424 (see above) that in any case ep. VIII could not have been written by the Catholicos Joseph. This argument is invalidated by what was elaborated above in section 4. All those who have dealt with the "correspondence" up to and including Fiey are of course familiar with the message in Bar Hebräus²⁰³:

Et reperiuntur epistolae consolatoriae a S. Iacobo Nisibeno et etiam a S. Ephraem missae ad hunc Papam ob amissionem dexterarum et increpatio contra episcopos, qui audacter ad[49]versus eum procedebant. Et quidam dicunt epistolas illas Iosephum Catholicum, cum depositus esset, composuisse²⁰⁴.

¹⁹⁹ LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 125 note 1 (126) and 21 note 1, in this last passage "du reste" stands for "cependant".

²⁰⁰ O. Braun, *The correspondence of the Catholicos Papa of Seleucia. A contribution to the history of the ostsyriscen Kirche im vierten Jahrhundert*, ZKTh 18, 1894, 163-182 übersetzte Texte, 546-565 Untersuchung. Modernizing Braun's orthography.

²⁰¹ LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 21 note 1: "Nous ne pouvons admettre, comme le fait M. Braun, qu'il y ait dans cette correspondance des parties apocryphes et des parties authentiques".

²⁰² BAUMSTARK, 124, note 10 and discussion of possible dates of origin of individual letters.

²⁰³ FIEV, *Jalons* (see note 1), 72, points out that M. Kmosko wrote the majority of the most important pieces. cke on the Papa - Miles conflict; the passage from Barhebraeus that interests us is also among them. Kmosko offers it within his treatise on Simeon Bar Sabba'e, *Patrologia Syriaca* I 2; 667 Syriac, 668 Latin. Kmosko thus quotes J. B. ABBELOOS/Th. J. LAMV, *Gregorii Barhebraei chronicon ecclesiasticum*, t. Braun, *Briefwechsel* (as note 200), 549 has the same volume number, Baumstark on the other hand (124) volume 2, - is he following LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (as note 8), 21 note 1 and 197 note 2, who for his part would have produced a scribal error?

²⁰⁴ Braun, *Briefwechsel* (see note 200), 559 sees the passage in Barhebräus as an "external witnesses to the "authenticity" of the two letters in question (in fact, Barhebräus only testifies to the *existence* of the correspondence), but points to the doubts expressed by the anonymous "quidam"

These are the Vth and VIth letters of the collection. To make it easier to understand, here is the list of lemmas for the eight letters:

(Braun, 164) I Letter of Eusebius, Patriarch of Rome, to Papa the Catholicos of the Orient.

(165) II Another (letter) from Juda Kyriakos, Bishop of Jerusalem, to Papa. III (Letter) from Queen Helena to Papa.

(166) IV (Letter) from St. Papa to Queen Helena.

(167) V Letter from St. James the Bishop to Papa.

(169) VI Follows (the letter) of Mar Aphrem, the teacher, to Mar Papa, the catholic, the patriarch.

(174) VII Letter from Mar Papa to the Nisibenes.

(178) VIII Synodal letter of the Western Fathers to Mar Papa, the Catholicos, in which they annul what had been done against him by the followers of Miles and their comrades.

Braun rightly divides the collection into two groups, I-IV and V-VIII, in terms of form and content. In the first group, the sentences are short, as are the letters themselves. The second group differs stylistically "much to its detriment" from the first group; it is characterized by an "excess of pathos", the same thought is presented in "numerous variations", the sentence constructions are so "quirky" that it is difficult to make sense of them²⁰⁵.

The geographical scope of the two groups of letters is also different; the first group extends not only into the Greek West, but even into Latin, while the second group, with the exception of ep. VIII, remains in the *Syrian* West.

The first group ends with a letter from Papa, but in the second group the penultimate letter already occupies the analogous position. This already gives Ep. VIII a special position. While letter VII *ends* with *vatici[50]nia ex eventu*, i.e. the alleged author looks to a future that has not yet come to pass, thus leaving a message to his church and giving the body of letters a spiritual conclusion, ep. VIII takes up anew the matter negotiated in the previous letters and clearly refers to these letters. Letter VIII identifies a large group of senders with *only Greek* names as members of a church assembly; the letters of Bishop Jacob of Nisibis and

. "It is possible that" Joseph "sought consolation in this model", but the dating should be based on ep. VII. The similarity of the situation (and character) of Papa and Joseph also in FIEV, Jalons (see note 1),⁷³ and note 34: "All sources <...> cite Papa's proud and dictatorial attitude as the main cause of the rebellion of the bishops" against him. "Cette attitude se rap- proche étonnement de celle du catholicos Joseph, à qui justement Bar Hebraeus attribue la confection de la correspondance de Pâpâ, laquelle l'aurait justifié et soutenu".

205 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 555-558.

of Ephrem were *translated from Aramaic into Greek*²⁰⁶ (these are ep. V and VI of the collection). Thus, as in Epistles I-IV, the Greek West is included here.

The anachronistic patriarchal title appears in the lemmas of Letters I and VI - in I also for the Bishop of Rome! While the title in these lemmata could be an addition to an original version, as Braun suggests²⁰⁷, I would not resort to this explanation in the other cases. In ep. I, the address also contains the title²⁰⁸. It also refers to the chair of Mar Thomas, a clear indication of late composition²⁰⁹. Ep. II has the address "dem Väterchen Papa,"²¹⁰; now it is

"Father" is of course a common episcopal address or collective term for bishops, cf. the "Western Fathers", who are often mentioned in our sources; but if the address then reads "fatherhood"²¹¹, this abstract term here stands for "patriarch". The address of ep. III refers to Papa as the "P a t r i a r c h of the Orient"²¹². Ep. IV, whose author is supposed to be Papa, is humble: "a small hut is our house of prayer"²¹³ - how large was the church in the "cities" at the time of the real Papa? We remember that the patriarchal topic of the 6th century included the linking of the legitimacy of the catholicos/patriarch to the "great church of Seleucia-Ktesiphon in Kōkē". Papa refers to himself as the "weak one"²¹⁴ - in view of his notoriously choleric character, this seems like a subtle irony on the part of the actual author. The epithet will be taken up again in one of the following letters. [51] Ep. V has the title "Patriarch" in the address²¹⁵. The letter is full of the form of address "fatherhood"²¹⁶, whereby the meaning oscillates between the spiritual and the institutional. The scene where "you stretched out your hand against the Gospel" is also alluded to here, with the "trial that came upon your fatherhood in the same hour" (meaning the paralysis of the arm with which Papa had struck the Gospel book - to the scandal of the Synodals)²¹⁷. Ep. VI offers the title in the lemma, as mentioned²¹⁸. Here, too, we have very

206 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 178.

207 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 556.

208 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 164.

209 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 165. Nowhere in the *Synodicon Orientale* is Thomas mentioned in association with the chair of Seleucia.

210 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 165.

211 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 165.

212 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 165.

213 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 166.

214 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 167. Cf. Mar Aba "die Schwäche des Katholikos".

215 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 167.

216 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 167-169 passim.

217 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 169.

218 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 169.

We hear that "Orient and Occident agreed to your patriarchal election" ²²⁰, sixty-eight ²²¹ years "you administered the high priesthood in Orient and Occident (!)" ²²². There are reports of the imprisonment and torture that Papa suffered ²²³. In ep. VII, Papa refers to himself again as "the weak one" ²²⁴, which the author of this group of letters has taken over from ep. III. The *vaticinia ex eventu*, evidence of the letter's inauthenticity, include the prediction of persecution ²²⁵:

"But the duration of the [52] tribulation in the Church of the East will be four weeks" (= 28 years, note the Danielic language, which gives the papa prophet status), "and three patriarchs one after the other like generals at the head of their camps will be accomplished in terrible ways of death". In Labourt, compare the series of the Katholikoi Simon Baršabba'e, Šahdost, Barbašemin with the death dates 341, 342, 346 before the decades-long vacancy during the great persecution ²²⁶.

The supplementary character of ep. VIII is already clear from the lemma ²²⁷, because

In Letter VII, Papa had already forgiven his opponents Miles etc. In the address ²²⁸, Papa is called Patriarch and Metropolitan, "your fatherhood" is addressed, as in the other letters; his long term of office is mentioned, as is the punishment that was meted out to him (for

219 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 167-173 passim.

220 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 171.

221 Cf. below in Letter VIII the age of 100 years. Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 561 f. attempts a biographical note on Papa: "The time of his birth is not reported anywhere; according to the information about his reign and his death, we may place it approximately between 220 and 230. According to Barhebraeus, he was ordained in 266 and died after a reign of 69 years, i.e. in 335. From the information in Mare we can only infer that he died at an advanced age after a reign of 70 years under Shapur (II). Abdisho gives him an approximate reign of 68 years. Amr, on the other hand, has him ordained as early as 247 and after a reign of 79 years

i. Die in 326. All these details are very late; the most probable are those of the otherwise reliable Barhebräu, since they <...> can best be reconciled with the dates of the letters, which are nevertheless old." As long as we have nothing better, the letters of our "Correspondence" must be regarded as the source for these chronological data, which therefore have no independent value. The dates of the long life and the long episcopate may seem legendary, but their conspicuous length must have imprinted them on the ecclesiastical memory in the same way as the blow on the book of the Gospels. Labourt in his *Table synchronique* (see LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 353) only states: "Verse 310: Papa". FIEV, Jalons (see note 1), 72 has "Papa (310-329)" in the heading.

222 And "Okzident" is a scribal error: repetition of the pair of terms mentioned shortly before (in Braun, Briefwechsel (as note 200), 171, there are now 3 short lines between the mentions).

223 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 173. How much is possibly preserved in it from older messages?

224 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 174.

225 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 176.

226 LABOURT, *Le christianisme* (see note 8), 353 *Table synchronique*.

227 See the lemmas compiled above.

228 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 178.

the blow to the book of the Gospels)²²⁹. His age is given as 100 years. The (allegedly "Western") authors speak of the "Orthodox", "who are with us "²³⁰.

The end of the surviving letter is particularly remarkable (the text breaks off before the actual end). To make the discussion easier, I have provided Braun's translation with a paragraph numbering²³¹.

"§ 1 It would have been profitable if the great grace of patriarchal dignity had not been given to the throne of your paternity. § 2 Because no metropolitans had been ordained in the region of the East, all bishops would have been subject to the throne of your holiness. § 3 But now your honor is diminished because of the patriarchs, and it is clear that this is the case because of the arrogance and disobedience of the metropolitans ordained by you. § 4 But we know that if the metropolitans had a mind devoted to their patriarch, they would not allow the disputes in their territory to become so great.

§ 5 Rather, the facts and the letters of our brother Mar Jakob²³²

that they provoke and promote them, without thinking that the patriarch will be the judge and punisher of their folly. § 6 Indeed, they repeatedly went to our fathers with a complaint against their patriarch, and when their objections were investigated and examined, not only were the patriarchs found to be right in the objections raised against them, but rather the metropolitans and bishops were found guilty, expelled from them and removed from their rank. § 7 And behold, they strike the church of your territory with the scourges of their rebellions and with the vengeance of their [53] partisanship.

§ 8 And this we have decided and²³³ devised for ourselves, that the church's be useful what our Fathers formerly ordained, when they conferred the patriarchal power on your Oriental See, which (is) in the Church of Kuke, namely, that he ordain metropolitans where he finds it useful, that he have power over them, to raise them up if they are worthy, and to depose them for their offenses, and likewise the patriarch shall be judge and punisher over all the bishops in the whole Church of his territory; he shall have the power and authority. § 9 And we also decree, agreeing to this,²³⁴ that anyone who causes strife and unrest and shakes off the patriarch's office from his neck, the patriarch shall remove and ordain another in his place. § 10 And he shall

229 All this Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 179.

230 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 180.

231 The following long quotation Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 181-182.

232 Ep. V in this collection.

233 Braun, Briefwechsel (see note 200), 181 note 2: The following "has Abdischo von Saliba as a quotation into his collection of canons. Cf. O. III 56; Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio* X 164".

234 This is where the quote from Ebedjesus ends.

Have power over all ordinations, irritations, depositions, <...> rebukes, over the establishment of canons, over the increase and enlargement of churches, monasteries and also of episcopal sees; even if it is necessary to reduce the same because of the existence and advantage of other churches and episcopal sees. We agree that <...>".

The passage quoted from ep. VIII is astonishingly ambivalent in its position on the patriarchal office. On the one hand, § 1 describes the patriarchal dignity as "a great grace" (i.e. probably a divine gift), but on the other hand it would be better if the addressee had not received it! The surprising explanation in § 2: without the bishops in the position of metropolitan, all bishops would be subject to you.

This means that the patriarch at the head of the metropolitan system is prevented from *directly* exercising his authority over all bishops by the intermediate hierarchical level of metropolitans. The author is obviously of the opinion that patriarchate and metropolitan system were introduced simultaneously in the Church of the East. § 3 repeats the negative assessment of the patriarchal dignity: because of it

"your honor is diminished"! and this is due to the metropolitans, whom the patriarch himself appoints (= he is part of the system that causes him so much trouble), they lack the expected loyalty (§ 4), they do not consider what judicial authority the patriarch has over them (§ 5). The negative assessment of the patriarchal office that has been expressed up to this point is almost overly empathetic to the feelings of the holder of the office, who would probably like to present himself as a "catholicos" in the most literal sense (however, the title "Katholikos" not even mentioned!). By attributing this judgment about his situation to the "Western fathers", the real author of the letter gives them, as outsiders, the role of a neutral authority that is not implicated in the acute disputes.

Should § 6 really apply to the time of Papa, in that the "western fathers" are looking back to the time of "our fathers", i.e. to the [54] third and early fourth centuries? The alleged authors of the letter must have had several such incidents in mind, as described in Agapet's speech in the edited Acts of 424, only projected further back in time. To what extent did the actual author get the time levels mixed up? Or is there literary influence here from the Acts of 424?

In § 8 begins the quotation that Ebedjesus took from ep. VIII, namely the provision now given by the "Western Fathers". Its content: it declares for

"useful" is an "*earlier*" provision of "our fathers", namely the introduction of the patriarchal-metropolitan system in the Orient. This retracts the criticism of this very system expressed in §§ 1-3 above - the system is useful for the Church *after all* (even if not to the same extent for its supreme leader?). The backward reference shifts the existence of the multi-level hierarchy of bishops to some prehistoric time - before Papa or in his early days long ago? The anachronism of the whole text is revealed when one sees how many periods are staggered one after the other. The quotation

of § 8 in Ebedjesu is, however, above all ver-

This is prompted by the assertion that *our fathers conferred patriarchal power* on the See of Tomorrow in the Church of Kōkē. The attachment to the (great) Church of Kōkē belongs to the patriarchal ideology as developed by Mar Aba. But since when has the patriarchal dignity been regarded in the Church of Persia as *conferred* from the "West" (i.e. from Antioch)? The most important function of the patriarch in § 8 refers to his authority to appoint metropolitans. Sections 9 and 10, not quoted by Ebedjesu, provide implementing provisions.

Our investigation above has shown that the consistent implementation of the metropolitan system under the "Great Metropolitan" (410) and the self-confident formulation of patriarchal ideology (540) *do not* coincide and that the title of patriarch was *not conferred* on the Catholicos of Seleucia-Ktesiphon, but that he claimed it for himself because it had become customary in the West for a chief metropolitan with whom one considered oneself to be of equal rank, i.e. for the one of Antioch. The minutes of the Synod of 410 are the document of the awareness of equality that was obviously shared there by the "Western" observer. Both the metropolitan system and the patriarchal title, however, are of Western origin; the first was perfected in Persia for pragmatic reasons, with the canonical assistance of the geographically closest ecclesiastical neighbors, who could live under more favorable political conditions; I have mentioned the motive for the adoption of the second: to express the existing equality of [55] Seleucia and Antioch in the terminology now common in the "West".

But what is the motive of our text to understand the patriarchal dignity as a title conferred by "Western fathers" on the bishop of Seleucia-Ktesiphon? Is it merely an extrapolation from the undeniable western origin of the title? Or did the author feel that the title required legitimization? The rest of the letter, which has unfortunately been lost, might have shown whether another topic other than the patriarch's authority over the metropolitans had been discussed, from which conclusions could have been drawn for this problem.

4 Older contributions to Syrian church history (written before 1992)

4.1 An unknown quote from *Contra Eunomium* of Theodor of Mopsuestia

The manuscript Or. 1319¹ in the Cambridge University Library contains, among other things, 36 cephalala (f. 90u - 104u), which are attributed to Nestorius. A. E. Goodman has devoted a study to them². Three of these Kephalaia (28.17.18)³ were already known from Vat. Syr. 179 f. 104, they have been included in the "Nestoriana" by Loofs (p. 371 text, p. 218 f. transl.). Both Loofs and Goodman would like to argue in favor of authenticity, but neither is entirely sure of their case. The problem of authenticity cannot be examined in detail here; it seems fairly certain to me that the Kephalaia were *not written* by Nestorius. They do not combat the μία φύσις and the σύγγυσις, but rather the ὑπόστασις σύνθετος and the σύνθεσις in the one person of Christ, and thus do not directly oppose Cyril at all, but rather the New Chalcedonian Christology, which refers to Cyril. The fact that Theodore of Mopsuestia is cited as a witness in no way speaks in favor of Nestorius as the author, because to my knowledge Nestorius never explicitly quotes the greatest Antiochian.

[98]) The quotation from Theodore is found in the 1st Cephalalaion (f. 90u - 91u). Its origin is given: it comes from the 18th λόγος⁴ against Eunomius. From this work by Theodore, only *one*⁵ quotation in Facundus IX, 3 (PL 67, col. 754 C) was previously known, which belongs in the "10th book". Facundus owes it, along with many other quotations, to Theodoret's Apology for Diodorus and Theodore⁶, so it is also found in this source. On the other hand, it can be assumed that the author of the Kephalaia had direct access to this source.

Note: I owe the opportunity to publish this quotation to the generosity of Rev. a. E. Goodman in Rampton/Cambridge. Rev. Goodman provided me with his photocopies of the Kephalaia as well as an English translation made by him, which of course made my own translation much easier. An edition of the entire manuscript Or. 1319 is planned; it contains Nestorian texts, many of which are unknown.

¹ Described by A. E. GOODMAN, *The Jenks Collection of Syriac Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Oct. 1939, p. 596-8.

² *Examination of some Nestorian Kephalaia (Or. University Library, Cambridge)* in: *Essays and Studies presented to Stanley Arthur Cook*, ed. by D. Wvnton Thomas (*Cambridge Oriental Series*, No. 2), London 1950, p. 73 ff. I am using an offprint with the page numbering 1-10.

³ Cf. GOODMAN, p. 1.

⁴ ܐܬܪܝܬܐ. This can also be called "homily", but is also used for logoi as subsections of a book.

⁵ Only PG 66, 1002 lists a second quotation; but this is a mistake. According to the text of the 6th session of the 5th Council, the quotation belongs to *De incarnatione*. As such, it appears correct even before PG 66, 985.

⁶ L. ABRAMOWSKI, *Remains of Theodoret's Apology for Diodorus and Theodore in Facundus*, *Studia Patristica* I [published 1957] (Texte und Untersuchungen 63), p. 61-69.

Nevertheless, one must ask whether the quotation was not invented by the author of the Kephalaia for his own purposes. In addition, the end of the quotation is not easy to determine. Does it coincide with the end of the 1st cephalaiion, or does the quotation end before that? These problems can only be discussed on the basis of the text. I will leave the section from the 1st Cephalaiion from the lemma of the quotation to the end of Cephalaiion, according to the text of the manuscript and in translation, as well as the largest [99] part of the 3rd Cephalaiion, which, as will be seen, is a kind of scholion to it.

[illegible]

* [Here - in consideration of L. A.'s references below - a continuous line count had to be introduced for both the text and the translation; in the original there is only a line count in steps of five for the translation *in the original - ed.*]

,יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ: כְּמִלְכָּא קִדְשָׁא מְלִיכָא דְּהִי, אֲדָרְבָּרָא עַל כָּךְ
 אֲהִיבְרִיחָא כִּי, אֲדָרְבָּרָא מִלְכָּא דְּהִי. מִלְכָּא קִדְשָׁא מְלִיכָא דְּהִי
 אֲדָרְבָּרָא עַל כָּךְ. אֲדָרְבָּרָא מִלְכָּא דְּהִי, אֲדָרְבָּרָא קִדְשָׁא
 מְלִיכָא דְּהִי: אֲדָרְבָּרָא, אֲדָרְבָּרָא, אֲדָרְבָּרָא. אֲדָרְבָּרָא
 מְלִיכָא דְּהִי, אֲדָרְבָּרָא
 ,מִלְכָּא דְּהִי, אֲדָרְבָּרָא מִלְכָּא דְּהִי, אֲדָרְבָּרָא מִלְכָּא דְּהִי
 אֲדָרְבָּרָא מִלְכָּא דְּהִי, אֲדָרְבָּרָא מִלְכָּא דְּהִי, אֲדָרְבָּרָא מִלְכָּא דְּהִי
 אֲדָרְבָּרָא מִלְכָּא דְּהִי, אֲדָרְבָּרָא מִלְכָּא דְּהִי, אֲדָרְבָּרָא מִלְכָּא דְּהִי

1Blessed Theodor₂ says this, along with many other things, in the 18th book against Eunomius. Book against Eunomius thus:₃ 'Prosopon' is used in two ways: either it denotes₇ [100]₄ the hypostasis and what each of us is, or it is attributed to the honor and₅ greatness and worship, as follows: 'Paul' and₆ 'Peter'₈ denote hypostasis and prosopon of each of them (both);₇ but the prosopon of our Lord Christ denotes honor and greatness and₈ worship. Because the God Logos revealed himself in humanity,₉ he combined the honor of his hypostasis with the visible. And that is why₁₀ the 'prosopon of Christ' denotes that it is (a prosopon) of honor, not (a₁₁ prosopon) of the usia of the two natures. For honor is neither nature nor₁₂ hypostasis, but a very large increase,₉ which is attributed from₁₃ cause of revelation. What purple robes or royal₁₄ garments are for the king, that is the beginning for the God Logos, which he took from us,₁₀ inseparable, inalienable, without (spatial) distance in worship.₁₁ So just as the king does not have purple,₁₇ robes by nature, neither does the God Logos have purple robes by nature.

7 The participle *aphelion* ,אֲהִי, which appears several times in the quotation, causes difficulties for translation and understanding if one wants to render it with the lexical meanings "cognoscere fecit, docuit, nuntiavit". Nuntiare is the most likely option. You have to try for the translation, to find the presumed Greek vocabulary. This seems to me to be σημαίνω. [100] It *c o i n c i d e s* with "nuntiare" in the meaning "to indicate"; in our case, the meanings "to signify, to signify" come into consideration, which I have used accordingly in my translation. Theodor himself can serve as a source: in a text from the 12th book of *De incarnatione* he uses this expression in the same way. The text is preserved in Greek in Leontius; for the sake of simplicity, I quote the very precise Latin version, Constitutum Vigili No. 48 (CSEL XXXV, 1 p. 276, 14-19): "Sed ad hoc dicunt quod Iesus nomen saluatorem significat (σημαίνει); 'sa- luator autem' dicunt 'quomodo ille homo dicatur?': obliiti, quod Iesus dicebatur etiam filius Naue et, quod mirandum est, quia non sic uocatus est fortuito in generatione sed transnominatus a Mose. certum autem est, quod non hoc imponere homini patiebatur, si autem diuinam naturam omnimodo significabat (σημαντικόν)".

8 "Peter and Paul" (in this order) in *De incarnatione*, lib. 12 (quote from Leontius, PG 66, 935).

9 Cf. *Phil.* 2, 9.

10 Cf. *De incarnatione* (lib. 15), Latin Labbé t. V, 461 D: "nec enim sicut homo in utero ut esset suscepit initium ..."

11 A good example of common worship is the quotation of Vigilius No. 9 from the 3rd book against Apollinarius (CSEL XXXV, 1 p. 245, 18-26).

nature flesh. If¹⁸ someone claims that the God Logos naturally has flesh, the divine Usia is alienated¹² through him, because he undergoes a²⁰ change by the addition of a nature. But if he^{21does} not have flesh by nature, Apollinarius says that the same is²² partially¹³ consubstantial with the Father in his divinity, and the same is consubstantial with us [101]²³ in the flesh, so that he can make him composite¹⁴.^{24For} he who is thus divided into natures is something composite, and²⁵ is found in nature. This text is commented on in 3 Keph 15 as follows:

¹Hypostasis and prosopon are the same thing in relation to people, in² whatever way it is said. ³The hypostasis of Paul is the prosopon of Paul, the hypostasis of Peter is the prosopon of Peter. ⁴But when we say 'prosopon' of our Lord Christ, i.e. of⁵ the two natures of the Godhead and of humanity, we are not also saying⁶ merely a composite hypostasis, but it means honor⁷ and greatness and worship. For he who was assumed, i.e.⁸ the human nature in which God incessantly reveals himself, attracted the⁹ glory of God and appeared to creation in the order of the proposal of the One-born¹⁰ God. The one prosopon is (a prosopon)¹¹ of honor. For although humanity has its own hypostasis, as¹² is the case, this hypostasis is the temple of its inhabitant and¹³ the revelation of the one who accepted him and the σημαντικός¹⁶^{14God}. And there was no time that he appeared by himself alone, so that his¹⁵ own prosopon without deity would have revealed itself to the beholder, but¹⁶ all that he is is exalted with the one who accepts him, as the garment with¹⁷ the one who puts it on, and as the purple with the king, and as the eikon¹⁸ with the archetype. That which belongs to each of them is not his own¹⁹ something that is in him, but that with which he is exalted. For if²⁰ is for himself the one who is assumed, or naked, or bare, or²¹ separate from the one who assumes him, two prosopa and two sons^{22would} be^{said}. But in that it is exalted in union²³ with the God Logos, the prosopon of God is revealed in the form of a servant. If indeed²⁴ two natures in the mortal make one hypostasis, O Apollinarius,²⁵ thus one nature makes the part of the hypostasis. This is not possible with God²⁶ ; and if two hypostases yield two prosopa, they also²⁷ yield two sons. ³⁰But if you say that the natures naturally share in one²⁸ other and that a composite hypostasis is formed from both²⁹ this hypostasis is something different from what it was before, because it is composite instead of simple, and it is completely estranged from the equality of essence with the Father³¹ . For while the essence of the Father remains in its³² simplicity, that of the Son is compounded. Whoever says this, [102]³³ introduces a difference in essence,

12 One may assume Greek ἀλλοίωσις.

13 Syriac apparently follows the freer word order possible in Greek, so that now literally reads: "As Apollinarius says in part that ...". But partial homousia is precisely the accusation leveled against Apollinarius, cf. as an excellent parallel the quotation from the 3rd book against Apollinarius, Vig. No. 1 (CSEL XXXV, 1 p. 237, 7-238, 36).

14 Jobius, a student of Apollinarius, explicitly advocated a "composite hypostasis", cf. M. RICHARD, *L'introduction du mot "Hypostase" dans la théologie de l'incarnation*, *Mél. de science religieuse*, 2 (1945), p. 8 f.

15 The title of this Kephalaion is: "How must hypostasis and prosopon be understood? become?"

16 ܠܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ.

and the fact of the *oikonomia* in³⁴ our humanity then means the reduction of its Redeemer! If³⁵ someone says that the hypostasis consists of two natures, that which is like the Father in³⁶ his divinity and that which is like us in his humanity³⁷, the p e r s o n who says this is really asserting the composition. ³⁸For every nature which has a hypostasis, which is divided into different natures³⁹ and which is related to them, is composite and alienated from ^{each} by nature. Those who think this of God ^{41 are} full of godlessness. For it must be said: he who is consubstantial with the Father,⁴² assumed i n s e p a r a b l y the one who is consubstantial with us, for his revelation⁴³ ... (This is followed by a comparison of the composite hypostasis with⁴⁴ a fabric of wool and linen. This comparison no longer has any paral⁴⁵ lele in 1 Ceph. and can therefore be omitted here).

Thus, 3 Ceph. follows the train of thought of the quotation in 1 Ceph. Step by step, right up to the end of 1 Ceph. Obviously, the commentator presupposes this text as an intellectual and literary unit. The fact that he feels the need to present such a paraphrasing commentary at all suggests that the *whole* text from the lemma to the end of 1 Ceph. belongs to an author other than the author of the Kephalaia. But then, given the accuracy of the lemma, no one other than Theodore comes into question. In the other Kephalaia there is no such case of one Kephalaion paraphrasing another in its entirety, although there is of course no lack of repetition of images and ideas.

Echoes of our quotation can also be found in other Kephalaia. Theodore says that the *prosopon* of Christ means "honor, greatness and worship" (Syr. line 4 f. and 7, transl. 4 f. and 7 f.). The author of the Kephalaia retains this threefold formula, not only in 3 Keph. (lines 6 f.), where it is expected anyway, but also with slight variations in other places. Thus it is used in a slightly different form in 2 Ceph.; in 9 Ceph. it is varied to "honor, authority, worship"; in 14 Ceph. it appears in its original form, only slightly stretched out. Of course, all the terms used in the series of three appear several times individually, as they are an integral part of later Antiochian and Nestorian Christology. The grouping of these terms into rows is clearly reminiscent of doxologies¹⁷ and makes their liturgical content¹⁸ particularly tangible.

17 Compare, for example, the doxologies from the Apocalypse of John.

[103] Αpc. 4.11 δόξα, τιμή, δύναμις (3)

5,12 δύναμις, πλοῦτος, σοφία, ἰσχύς, τιμή, δόξα, εὐλογία (7)

5,13 εὐλογία, τιμή, δόξα, κράτος (4)

7,12 εὐλογία, δόξα, σοφία, εὐχαριστία, τιμή, δύναμις, ἰσχύς (7)

12,10 σ ω τ η ρ ί α, δύναμις, βασιλεία (God), ἐξουσία

(Christ) (4) 19,1 σωτηρία, δόξα, δύναμις (3)

(Is it a coincidence that the number of row members shows this regularity of arrangement: 3, 7, 4, 7, 4, 3? In any case, it is a game with the number 7, whole or broken down. The symbolic significance of this number is well known, as is the Apocalypse's penchant for numerical symbolism).

18 I may refer to my remarks in *Oriens christianus* 41 (1957), p. 63 f.

[103] The author of the Kephalaia is particularly fond of one idea in the quotation, which must still concern us from another point of view: the idea of "revelation" (in the quotation, lines 8 and 12 or 8 and 13). It is found again in 3 Cephesisans, and very strongly; also in 8, 10 and 12 Cephesisans.

If we have so far looked for echoes of the quotation in the other Kephalaia, we must now ask what theological differences arise. A comparison of the quotation and Ceph. 3 At the end of the quotation, the *conclusion* is *drawn* from Apollinarius' Christology that he teaches a Christ composed of God and man; it is not said that Apollinarius asserted a composite Christ. For the 3rd Ceph. on the other hand, the composite hypostasis is the *thesis* of the opponent, which must be combated, as in all other Cephalaia. More important is the shift in the use of the term "hypostasis" that can be observed. The quotation applies this term to Christ only once¹⁹, and it is used to refer to the God Logos (text line 8, translation line 9). *There is no* mention of the humanity of Christ as a hypostasis. It is different in 3 Ceph. where it says (lines 11 f.): "For even if humanity (sc. Christ) has its own hypostasis ..." Of course, the consequence that two hypostases result in two prosopa is later rejected as false.

One idea in the quotation strikes me as conspicuous and suspicious: "revelation" (see above) and its role in the constitution of the one person of Christ. I am not otherwise familiar with this emphasis from Theodore's writings[104]. In the four speeches from the baptismal catecheses, for example, which are dedicated to Christology (Hom. catéch. V-VIII), it does not appear at all. There is only one exception: Hom. VII § 15, but this is a quotation from Titus 2:13 and therefore refers to the return of Christ on

End of time. ⲕⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ is used here for ἐπιφάνεια; we can also find this Greek term as an equivalent in the corresponding passages of the Kephalaia

and especially of the quotation. Typical for Theodore is not the thought connection συνάφεια - ἐπιφάνεια, but συνάφεια - οἰκονομία. In 3 Ceph. the words "revelation" and "reveal" appear five times. They were obviously important to the author of the Kephalaia.

It is certainly not necessary to consider the whole quotation to be spurious because of this idea, which is otherwise not found in Theodor, especially as parallels can be found to the rest of the text. However, under these circumstances it seems justified to make a small emendation. I would suggest that the sentence lines 10-12 (text ⲕⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲕⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ, or 11-13 (translation "For honor - from cause of revelation") should be deleted as an explanatory gloss that has penetrated the text. In form, this sentence is a typical gloss; in terms of content, it leaves a lasting impression after its Deletion is not a gap. Of course, the idea of revelation (two sentences

¹⁹ Previously, in the case of the human individual, "hypostasis" is twice declared to be identical with "pro-sopon"; later it is said that "honor" is not a hypostasis.

before) is still included in the text; after all, it was he who initiated the gloss. However, after deleting the gloss, it does not seem as emphasized. Normally, however, one would also expect the following: "*When* the God Logos revealed himself in humanity, he combined the glory of his hypostasis with the visible." Has an ὅτε been read into ὅτι here? An incorrect resolution of a Greek participle could also be the reason. Which of the two possibilities one wants to consider - if one wants to conjugate at all - depends on whether one considers the kephalaia to be originally Greek or not²⁰.

²⁰ Goodman (*Examination* p. 4) is convinced of the Greek version of the Kephalaia.

4.2 Ps. Nestorius and Philoxenus of Mabbug

As I have shown elsewhere,¹ the dialog² between "Nestorius" and "Sophronius" at the beginning of the Liber Heraclidis³ was not written by Nestorius himself, but by another author, whom I have called "Ps.-Nestorius". Ps. Nestorius must be localized in Constantinople; his extensive introduction to the second Apology of Nestorius was written between 451 and 525⁴ - a more precise dating has not yet been possible. Now, however, the terminus post quem can be moved three decades closer to the terminus ante quem; the historical background for the dialog thus becomes clearer and makes the text much more interesting.

This progress has been made possible by the excellent account of the work and theology of Philoxenus of Mabbug, which is due to André de Halleux.⁵ With the help of this account, one can recognize that one of the Christological opinions combated by Ps. Nestorius is none other than that of Philoxenus (Ps. Nestorius does not mention any heretics by name apart from the Arians, Paulinians and Manichaeans, so as not to betray himself through anachronisms).

From a purely formal point of view, the dialogue of Ps. Nestorius is divided into two parts, a first, which is really dialogical (Bedjan 10-76; Nau 5-49), and a second, in which the dialogical form is abandoned (Bedjan 76-125; Nau 49-816). The difference in form also corresponds to a difference in content: the dialog section deals with various false Christologies in a polymorphous manner, while the subsequent treatise presents the author's opinion in context.

The dialogical part of Ps. Nestorius' writing can be broken down as follows:

Prooemium to the whole of Scripture, Bedjan 10:8-11:5; Nau 5:7-

24. Introduction, Bedjan 11:7-14:8; Nau 5:26-7:30.

a) "Gentiles", "Jews", "Manichaeans", "Paulinians",⁷ Bedjan 11:7-12:8; Nau 5:26 to 6.20.

b) "Arians", Bedjan 12:12-13:15; Nau 6:24-7:18.

¹ L. Abramowski, *Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius* (CSCO 242 = Subsidia 22), Löwen 1963, p. 108 ff.

² The chapter headings that give the text its face today are a later Syriac ingredient.

³ Nestorius, *Le livre d'Héraclide de Damas*, ed. P. Bedjan, Paris/Leipzig 1910, 10-125; that. trad. F. Nau, Paris 1910, 5-81.

⁴ *Investigations* p. 199 f.

⁵ A. de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog. Sa vie, ses écrits, son théologie*, Louvain 1963.

⁶ *Investigations* p. 158 ff.

⁷ That is, the followers of Paul of Samosata.

c) "Heresies arising from the aforementioned groups",⁸ Bedjan 13:17-14:8; Nau 7,20-30

[123] 1. Christological opinions that shortchange the humanity of Christ, Bedjan 14:11-63:14; Nau 8:1-40:17.

a) God "becomes" flesh, Bedjan 14:119-34:18; Nau 8:1-21:3.

b) The flesh is transformed into the ousia of God, Bedjan 34:19-49:4; Nau 21:4-30:18.

c) μία φύσις by συναγωγή and σύνθεσις φυσική, but ἔνωσις without vermi- tion, Bedjan 49:9-63:14; Nau 30:21-40:17.

2. "Heresies that confess Christ only as a man", Bedjan 63:17-76:10; Nau 40:20-49:2.

a) ("Sabellians" ¹⁰) Bedjan 64:9-13; Nau 40:35-41:4.

b) Two-sons doctrine, Bedjan 64:17-76:10; Nau 41:8-49:2.

The fight against Philoxenus is of course to be found in the first section of the dialogical part, and it is meant by the first variant; it is therefore text 1a), Bedjan 14,11-34,18 (Nau 8,1-21,3),¹¹ which is to be considered from this point of view. As in the entire dialog, "Sophronius" also has the task in this passage of presenting the arguments of the Christology that has just been contested. In 1a) he therefore takes the view that God can become man without ceasing to be God by nature; that he has nevertheless become man "in truth"; more abstractly: that a nature can become another nature without giving up its first nature.¹²

Among the examples of the possibility of such a process are the miracles of Exodus 7: "The rod of Moses,¹³ when it truly became serpent, is serpent (and) also rod; and the water of the Nile, which became blood, became the nature of blood (and) also of water. It is the same ousia, even when it is changed" (Bedjan 25:17-20; Nau 15:14-17).¹⁴ Philoxenus also gives the same examples as "types du devenir sans changement obscurément prédits dans les miracles de l'Exode" in his unprinted commentary on the prologue to the Gospel of John.

⁸ This section is completely mutilated, but was probably very short anyway. Almost only the secondary (see note 2 above) Syriac chapter headings have survived.

⁹ Bedjan 14,9 (Nau 8,6) is the first time that "Sophronius" is mentioned; this also makes it clear that everything preceding is introduction.

¹⁰ This designation is a secondary insertion.

¹¹ It is analyzed in the studies on pp. 137-144.

¹² Like Ps. Nestorius, the "Nestorian" Habib also opposes this thesis of Philoxenus, namely with the same objection, namely "estimant contradictoire qu'un être devienne en restant ce qu'il était", de Halleux p. 229. On the writing of Philoxenus against Habib and on the person of the latter see de Halleux pp. 225-238.

¹³ In the biblical text, it is Aaron's staff that becomes a snake.

¹⁴ Investigations p. 140.

s¹⁵ and apparently also in other writings.¹⁶ Neither "Sophronius" nor Philoxenus limit themselves to these two examples; Philoxenus' series of Exodus miracles is much longer, and it is likely that the others of "Sophronius" can be found in Philoxenus texts.¹⁷

In Philoxenus and Ps. Nestorius, these examples serve to demonstrate a "Christology of becoming" (the term coined by de Halleux). The "Becoming" is of course that of John 1:14. It is to de Halleux's credit [124] to have emphasized the "mystery of divine becoming" as the basic idea of Philoxenus' Christology:¹⁸ "La définition christologique qui lui tient le plus à coeur et qui revient inlassablement sous sa plume est celle du devenir sans changement"; "an infinite number of passages" attest to this.¹⁹ For the "becoming" in the presentation and refutation of Philoxenus' doctrine by Ps. Nestorius, I refer to the texts I cited in the treatment of this section²⁰.

Philoxenus insists emphatically that the Logos became man "truly", "really", "in truth" and not merely in a σχῆμα, in the δόκησις, in a figment of the imagination. Accordingly, Ps. Nestorius has "Sophronius" persistently operate with these keywords.²¹

What then of the "reality" of the angelic apparitions and the appearances of God to the pious of the Old Testament? The Philoxenian answer to this question²² is given by Ps. Nestorius through the mouth of "Sophronius" in a very distorted way²³ and reduced to absurdity with mockery.

For anyone trained in Antiochene theology, the "becoming" of the Logos into man puts the axiom of the immutability of God at risk in an intolerable way. The argument of the immutability, incapacity to suffer, infinity of God (which allows no limitation) on the Antiochene (and Nestorian) side is constantly countered by the Monophysites with the argument of the omnipotence of God, who can do anything he wants. This fixed topos of the Christological controversy is discussed in relative detail by Ps.

15 de Halleux p. 155 and 325.

16 de Halleux p. 155 note 28 and p. 325 note 40 gives from the book against Habib and the Sentenzenbuch contains parallel passages to the passage in John's commentary, but I cannot tell from his information whether they refer to the serpent and blood miracle or rather to the other miracles from Exodus 10. 14. 9. 3, which Philoxenus also mentions.

17 Cf. the "Sophronius" speeches Bedjan 24-27 (Nau 14-16) with what de Halleux p. 325 says about the Philoxenus' efforts says.

18 de Halleux p. 317 ff.

19 de Halleux p. 317 with note 3.

20 See note 11 above - Just count "devenir" and "devenu" in Nau's translation!

21 Compare Investigations p. 137 ff. with de Halleux p. 366 ff.

22 de Halleux p. 369 f.

23 Investigations p. 141.

24 While Philoxenus argues for the omnipotence of God without deriving his changeability from it,²⁵ Ps. Nestorius counters this with the unalterable immutability of the divine ousia in the sense of his tradition.²⁶

The fact that it was more important to Ps. Nestorius to give voice to and refute the main accusations of Philoxenus against the representatives of the Antiochian tradition (Philoxenus also calls the Chalcedonians "Nestorians" according to Monophysite usage) than to create a perfectly formed literary work of art is shown by the abrupt way in which he incorporates the "anti-intellectualism" ²⁷ of Philoxenus into the debate. The author of the dialog had "Nestorius" pose a dilemma: either God becomes flesh, in which case he is no longer God, which is impossible - or the flesh is a figment of the imagination. Sophronius' answer to this is: "You accept with *natural reason* (ἐν λόγῳ φυσικῶ) what ought to be accepted *in faith*; you reduce it to impossibilities, and from the faith of Christianity you separate us in truth like pagans and like Manichaeans who are offended by the cross of Christ".²⁸

The identification of the theological opponent in the part of the Pseudo-Nestorian Dialogue that interests us here means that the occasionally almost incomprehensible text now becomes much more transparent; especially since we now know what the Christology that Ps. Nestorius' Christology in this section and the wider context in which the opposing arguments he rather untidily piled up belong.

The literary activity of Philoxenus extends over four decades, from around 480 to 521.²⁹ The year of death of the exiled bishop of Mabbug - almost certainly 523/30 - is almost the terminus ante quem for the writing of Ps. Around 480 would be the terminus a quo.

Since we have to look for Ps. Nestorius in Constantinople, we can ask ourselves whether the two appearances of Philoxenus there cannot be linked to the composition of the Dialogue. Since the actual exchange of words only begins with Philoxenus' Christology,³¹ it is reasonable to assume that it provided the actual occasion for the composition of the writing. In his letter to the monks of Senun in 521, Philoxenus complained that during his two visits to Constantinople, he had been confronted by "Nestorian

²⁴ Bedjan 19:3-21:11; Nau 11:23-12:21.

²⁵ de Halleux p. 347 ff. 475 f. A brilliant argument of Philoxenus against the Antiochian Apathy axiom *ibid.* p. 347 note 32.

²⁶ Investigations p. 137 f.

²⁷ de Halleux p. 326 gives this name to the attitude of Philoxenus, "non sans quelque exagération d'ailleurs". Philoxenus' anti-rationalism mainly has an anti-"nestorian" intention, cf. *ibid.* p. 430. 437. 475 f.

²⁸ Bedjan 23:5-9; Nau 13:21-25; Studies p. 139.

²⁹ de Halleux p. 315.

³⁰ de Halleux p. 101.

³¹ See note 9 above.

heretics" had been persecuted. This complaint can easily be related to the apparently unsuccessful visit of 507, when he made himself so unpopular with his desire to condemn the great Antiochians, the Synod of Chalcedon and the *Tomus Leonis* that Emperor Anastasius had to persuade him, for better or worse, to leave the capital in secret.³² The situation is different with Philoxenus' constant stay in 484:³³ "Nous ne voyons pas bien la nature des persécutions que Philoxène essuya à cette occasion; en effet, non seulement la politique religieuse de l'empereur Zénon et du patriarche Acace favorisait davantage les monophysites depuis la publication de l'hénotique, mais on sait déjà que le dénonciateur de Calédon obtint gain de cause; s'était-il heurté dans la capitale aux milieux monastiques chalcédoniens d'où provenait le patriarche d'Antioche qu'il venait diffamer".³⁴

Since it is fairly certain that Ps. Nestorius was a monk,³⁵ we have to see in him a representative of those dyophysite "milieux monastiques" of Constantinople who were hostile to Philoxenus. Nevertheless, I see no possibility of dating the *Dialogue* of Ps. Nestorius with certainty to either 484 or 507; the combination of the time of composition with Philoxenus' travels to Constantinople remains hypothetical in any case.

The composition of the various parts of the *Liber Heraclidis* thus took place in three successive stages: 1. the genuine part, i.e. the second *Apology* of Nestorius, was written between 438 and 450;³⁶ 2. the insertions of the constantinopolitan interpolator between 451 and 470;³⁷ 3. the dialog of Ps. Nestorius between 480 and 525. In addition to the genuine parts, the text of Ps. Nestorius can be of particular interest because of the rarity of contemporary dyophysite writings.

³² de Halleux p. 60 ff. - de Halleux considers only two stays of Philoxenus in Constantinople possible and provable (p. 59 and p. 60 note 72), so that contrary to the usual opinion a meeting between Philoxenus and Severus during the latter's stay in Constantinople 508-511 is not possible. has taken place.

³³ de Halleux p. 37 f.

³⁴ de Halleux p. 61.

³⁵ *Investigations* p. 145. 198. 199.

³⁶ *Investigations* p. 203.

³⁷ *Investigations* p. 130.

4.3 Dadisho Qatraya and his Commentary on the Book of the Abbas Isaiah

This Dadisho is called after his birth-place to distinguish him from a famous namesake living in the 6th century who was also a monk. The author of the Commentary mentioned in the title of my paper belongs to the later 7th century. Both bearers of the name were Nestorians.

The Commentary of the later Dadisho was edited and translated into French by René Draguet in CSCO, volumes 326 and 327 (= 144 and 145 in the Series Syriaca of the Corpus), in 1972. The Book of the Abbas Isaiah is the Syriac version and development of wisdom material from the fathers of the Egyptian desert. The Commentary on Abbas Isaiah originally consisted of 26 logoi, 15 of which have been preserved. Draguet thinks highly of Dadisho's work: "By the quality of exegesis, the breadth of erudition and the sobriety of style, the commentary belongs to the best productions of Nestorian literature; the tools of philological analysis are used to serve the doctrinal synthesis" (versio p. 8*).

All the older Greek sources used by Dadisho were known to him from Syriac translations. In commenting Isaiah he notes textual variants in different manuscripts, also differences in punctuation and their effect on the understanding of the text. It is evident that they had the use of a rich library. "He quotes the Apophthegmata of the Egyptian fathers from the Syriac *Paradise* or other collections", the Macarian literature, "the opuscula of [68] Mark the Hermit, the *Historia Lausiaca*, the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, Evagrius, Athanasius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostome, Basil, Theodoretus, Mar Babai, John the Seer and others" (versio p. 9*). The author displays a distinct sense of the distance in time between his own present and the golden time of the first desert fathers.

He tells us, where he composed the discourses which have come down to us: I to VI were written in the monastery of Rabkennare and VII to XIII in the monastery of the Holy Apostles (versio p. 13*). Of course he did not doubt that the work he commented on was in its entirety the work of Isaiah. Nor could he guess that his Syriac Isaiah represented the last of a long development of growing material (versio p. 16*). In this paper I shall not treat the spirit of the Syriac Isaiah and of Dadisho as such. Draguet, in his editions of Isaiah and of Dadisho, has provided very useful indexes of the spiritual topoi; the student is referred to them. Here I shall draw attention to some points I found when I read the commentary. Except the first they concern the practice of the spiritual life and the problems raised by traditions of different origins.

Article note: Dr. Luise Abramowski, Professor at the University of Tübingen, Germany, is a scholar in Syriac heritage.

nities in which both Dadishos lived. The responses and antiphonies mentioned by our Dadisho presuppose singing or saying them in a group rather in the form of the convent than of the semi-anachoretic way of life.

Those hymns and chants are not the hymns and canons in use "until now", which of course speaks strongly against them in the eyes of Dadisho. The *young* solitaries are responsible for [70] the introduction and they must be blamed for this deviation from the old and proven. With the exaggeration born of anger Dadisho asserts that the inventors continue daily with further additions. The root of the development is located by the author in the spiritual poverty and lack of observance in the young which he does not hesitate to call their ruin. The possibility to consider the multiplication of hymns as an increase of the praise and glorification of God in the community does not enter Dadisho's argument at all. The solitaries - we may speak of them as monks in this connection - cannot possibly find *time* for their proper observances when they are obliged to *know* (by heart) such abundance of hymns and canons. So time and mind are occupied when they should properly be used for quietness, concentration, meditation.

In passing I want to point to an obvious analogy to the development Dadisho complains about: in Cluny and the monasteries attached to it the hours of office were lengthened by being filled up with more readings and chantings which changed the older Benedictine usage. Time for manual or other work, prescribed in Benedict's rule, was very much reduced and the famous balance of Benedict's inspiration destroyed. Though this happened three centuries later and in the Latin West, it is interesting to see comparable changes occurring here and there. To return to Dadisho: in discourse XII he remarks spitefully that to *know* such an amount of hymns and canons "is the work of *klerikoi* and *eskolayē* and not of solitaries" (p. 141,17 f. versio). Draguet with his great knowledge of Syriac literature calls the first group "clercs et scolastes", "clerics and scholiasts". According to the average French dictionary a "scolaste" is some-body making scholia, i. e. annotations to a text; but the usual meaning "pupils" or

"students" seems more applicable here where learning by repetition matters. In any case, Dadisho always seems to mention the *eskolayē* with disdain. Since they appear more frequently in another context of the commentary we shall deal with them later.

According to Dadisho the proper work of the solitaries is "the suffering, the tears, the labor of penitence." If they are busy with too much liturgical practice, there is left no place for the real work of the solitary. In other words: spiritual life [71] is made too easy, the long solitary hours of silence are shortened, the life of the monks loses much of its character.

Of course the recurring comparison with the ideal olden time of the first Egyptian fathers is applied to the problem treated here. At that time - already more than three hundred years ago for Dadisho - the deplorable multitude of hymns and canons did not exist. Historically valuable is the comparison with the immediate past of the another himself [*i. e.* his namesake? - *the editor*]. From Babai the Great's "Rules for the novices" Dadisho quotes the precept concerning the things to be said by the solitary

in his cell at compline and at night and can detect only *one* hymn and not several in the series of texts, and this one hymn belongs to the compline only. And from his own experience Dadisho tells us that in the convent of Rabban Shapur only one hymn was said and that only at the second office of the night; at complines they had no hymn, not even on Sundays (p. 142 versio). And this was their usage, though they had several brothers who practiced the canon, among them the famous Makarinus with a beautiful carrying voice. Nevertheless, Rabban Shapur and the fathers with him did not allow the brothers to charge themselves with anything capable to diminish the ardour of their labours (ibid.).

What unseemly struggles have been the result of the changes in the offices! Especially at feast days, above all on Palm Sunday! The days of the saints which should be days of rejoicing and exultation for superiors and inferiors have changed to times of sorrow and grief by the multiplication and the innovation of hymns. How the singers enjoy themselves in intoning them, even if the hymns are insipid and composed by some youngster! (p. 142 versio). - We may well gather that Dadisho was one of those who protested against the alterations and so perhaps contributed to the quarrels he deplores so much.

3 The solitaries and the meaning of scripture

The subject just discussed belongs to the wider context of attacks by the devils against the monks. Also a diabolical instrument is the wish to search the meaning of scripture (XIII 4 ff.). Therefore the study of the bible is to be undertaken with extreme caution - and that rule applies not only to the novices. [72] The danger of independent biblical study consists in using up time and zeal which should be concentrated on corporal and spiritual observances fit for the solitaries work, prayer, thinking about God, meditation on moral progress. While the matter of the multiplied hymns was something quite new, a problem of contemporary solitary life, the zeal to discover the meaning of scriptural passages was discussed already by the

Book of the Abbas Isaiah. The thing to be avoided is a "perpetual and disordered study of scripture" (versio p. 139). Isaiah is quoted as saying: "To love the searching of scriptures brings about hostility and dissension, while weeping over your sins leads to concord". It is even to be thought of as a *sin* when the solitary in his cell is

searching into the scriptures and not into his own sins. Searching the scriptures is permissible only when it is done wisely and orderly and under guidance, according to

Isaiah. Dadisho fears that the very young brethren, being laymen in scriptural matters, may go astray in their search "like *eskolayē*". When they gather together they get excited over the study of meanings; all of which lead to heated debates and invectives (versio p. 139). Dadisho quotes with approval the abbas Poimen who

counseled that profitable talk among brethren should take the sayings of fathers for its subject, because talking about the scriptures is dangerous. The reason for Poimen's counsel is explained in discourse VI 4 (Dadisho himself

refers back to that passage). As already in case of Isaiah he feels obliged to justify the warning of the senior: of course the senior does not intend to honor the writings of the fathers above the scriptures. But there is the danger of the brothers falling into a blasphemous understanding of biblical texts. Meanwhile, the sayings of the fathers recommend themselves, because they are simple and clear (p. 82 versio) and therefore easy to understand. When a young brother seeks a "gnostic senior" (that is a senior of wisdom and knowledge) to learn about biblical matters from *him*, that is of course to be recommended (ibid.).

After this digression in XIII 5 on hymns (see above) Dadisho returns to the main problem in XIII 6 (p. 143 ff. versio). As is his habit in the treatment of Isaiah, now single points of possible obscurity are considered. We hear that there had been [73] in Egypt brothers who wished to pass on their love of knowledge concerning the meaning of scripture and the mysteries of divine *oikonomia*. But in this way they endangered and destroyed the ability to observe solitude and seclusion. Knowledge of truth is to be acquired in other ways: by teaching and by grace. By teaching: by listening to teachers; by grace means: to acquire knowledge "from the glory of the observances". But what do the brothers do: even in the offices of the psalms they ponder over the meaning of phrases. Sometimes they feel enlightened about the meaning and then they are proud of it - but they do not recognize that the "light" is coming from the devil (p. 144). Dadisho tells us that the blessed Anthony himself did *not* read the scriptures and their commentaries (p. 145 versio). The warnings of Isaiah are not intended for beginners only or for brothers in the middle stage, but also for the perfect, who have been illuminated by grace about sense and interpretation of the scriptures (p. 146 versio). God is best honored not by knowledge as such of a multitude of significations: but by ascetic labours which are never without fear of God and the terror of the last judgement (p. 147). If you want to know numerous scriptural meanings, commence with the knowledge of God, and the beginning of *that* is to keep the commandments (p. 148 versio).

In the lengthy treatment of the problems of bible study one senses Dadisho's uneasiness in his need to apologize for the ordinances of the abbas Isaiah and to justify them. Perhaps in the older material, commented upon by Dadisho, last echoes are audible of the fights between Egyptian Origenist and anti-Origenist monastic factions. One of the means to compose fights of this kind was to forbid discussions about the meaning of difficult words and passages, except under the guidance of a senior.

4 Dadisho and the *eskolayē*

We already had occasion to note the disdain of *eskolayē* expressed by our author, and felt some difficulty to define the meaning of the term. Let us first collect the material.

- a) In VIII 3, explaining Isaiah's order that a brother reading or psalmodising at table or in the assembly should not be corrected, except when he asks for it himself,

Dadisho says [74] that few people are able to correct in a manner acceptable to the reader. And he continues: "En effet, à l'assemblée commune des frères réunis pour la prière et la lecture, c'est le sens des paroles des Pères qu'ils doivent s'expliquer les uns aux autres *et pas non des lectures de mots*, - *ce qui est un travail de eskolayē et non pas de solitaires réservés et qui se gardent*; - et s'il faut une correction des mots des lectures ..." (versio p. 102).

b) In X 2 we find Dadisho saying: *Some of the eskolayē, professors (badoqē) or who are called by them teachers (malphanē) - of words, without works - who left the common knowledge of scriptures which cannot be acquired but by practice of the commandments ... deride the saint abbas Isaiah, saying that he is the teacher (malphana) of the youths in the school (beth sephrē); I myself have heard this once from one of them and was astonished by his audacity and stupidity*". The contrary is true: bishops, teachers and wise men would do well to learn from Isaiah when they start with monasticism.

c) XI 2 (p. 111 versio): "Cette observance du monachisme est plus élevée que, et différente de, toutes les observances du monde, non seulement de celle des fidèles *mais aussi des scolastes et des clercs*, et toute la pratique et la beauté de son œuvre tient dans la retraite".

d) XI 7 (p. 120 versio) will be treated below in connection with Theodore of Mopsuestia. We will note here only that Theodore's historical interpretation of scripture is considered as fit (only) for the eskolayē.

The following passages from discourse XIII have been treated already in the last section from another point of view.

e) XIII 4 (p. 139 versio): The young brethren are warned that they should not lead their mind astray after the sense of scripture "like eskolayē" and then quarrel about it.

f) XIII 4 (p. 140 versio) "... ceux qui étaient incultes" (idiotai) "et incapables d'apprendre à discuter sur la sagesse", les diables "les poussaient à *étudier et à méditer le sens des écritures à la façon des scolastes*, en négligeant la méditation profitable du salut de leur vie".

[75] g) XIII 5 (p. 141 versio): How to think about the betterment of your life as solitary, "quand il est requis de connaître une telle abondance d'hymnes et de canons? C'est là en effet *l'ouvrage des clercs, scolastes, et non celui de solitaire*". For this last passage I have considered above "pupil" or "student" as translation for eskolaya. But pupil in the meaning of schoolboy is evidently rendered by "youth in the beth sephrē", see (b), though that seems to be an expression used by the party Dadisho is hostile to, that is to say by the eskolayē themselves. The best way to render eskolayē seems to be the generic "people of the school", school people. In all the passages quoted a hostility between monastery and (theological) school and vice versa, see (b), is surfacing which can remind one of similar tensions between monastic and scholastic theology in the medieval Latin West. Dadisho, the solitary, looks down on the works of secular clerics and eskolayē, see (g), and the eskolayē retort with disparagement of the spiritual authority of the abbas Isaiah, taken as his text by Dadisho, see (b).

What are the "works" of the *eskolayē*, if we try to turn the sneers of Dadisho into a positive description? 1. they are "teachers of words", see (b). 2. they have to know the correct way to "read" a word, see (a), - in a language where the written word consists only of the consonants an art in itself. (Remember that the continuous script of Greek or Latin manuscripts also required the ability of "reading" to break the line correctly into words). 3. they are the people who are expected to know (by heart, evidently) such an amount of hymns and canons see (g); that is to say they are used to learning by repetition. 4. among the *eskolayē* are *badoqē* and *malphanē*, researchers and teachers, see (b). 5. they are people busy with historical exegesis of the scriptures in the manner of Theodore of Mopsuestia, see (d).

By all this it becomes evident that the *eskolayē* of all degrees are the students and professors of a / or the Nestorian School of Theology (Nisibis?). If those tensions existed between monastery and school, what then is the authority of the Interpreter himself in the eyes of Dadisho?

[76] 5 Theodore of Mopsuestia in Dadisho's commentary

Discourse I 17, p. 19 versio.

After citing St. Paul on love, Dadisho goes on: The blessed Interpreter and the fathers of the desert are in harmony when writing on love - sometimes they distinguish between the love of God and the love of our neighbor, sometimes not. He then quotes from Theodore's book "On the perfection of the observances." The title of this work was known from Abdisho, the quotation here seems the only fragment known so far. Theodore is commenting Lamentations 3,27-30 which is therefore quoted by Dadisho himself; the Interpreter's text follows, its tenor being that only the solitary in his retreat can have complete love of God and neighbor. In fact, of the four lines of biblical text, two are interpreted as concerning the solitary - is the book really by Theodore? In I 20 (p. 23 versio) Theodore's teaching is only referred to, being that humility and love affirm and condition each other - does this allude to the same book by Theodore? I 36 (p. 37 versio) wants to explain why abbas Isaiah, the desert fathers and the Interpreter order us to pray for the help of the Spirit to accomplish our virtues. Did we not receive the Spirit in baptism? In any case it is the same Spirit (this against the Messalians). Framed by quotations from Marcus Eremita and Evagrius two excerpts from Theodore's explication of the Lord's Prayer appear (the second repeated in VII 3). Draguet could not find the quotations in the Catechetical Homily on the Lord's Prayer, but they could easily come from the Commentary on Matthew. In the first quotation Theodore says in explanation of "Your kingdom come:" "He calls here 'kingdom of heavens' the grace of the Holy Spirit." Explaining Matth. 5,8 in the second quotation Theodore paraphrases: "Blessed are who have a spirit pure of bad actions, because they will be favored with an abundant action of the Spirit and will receive

by this the exact revelation of God" (repeated without the first line in VII 14). The use of "exact" [ἀκριβής, syr. ܐܕܬܬܝܒܐ- *the ed.*] is characteristic of Theodore, the meaning here is "perfect, complete." In I 37 (p. 39 verso) we have a short excerpt from the Commentary on John, identified by Draguet: "We being always with him and showing him with great care our endeavors about him." VII 7 (p. 90 verso): In this chapter Dadisho is collecting definitions of "that power of the Spirit which the perfect receive down here." He begins with [77] Paul (the Epistle to the Hebrews in fact), goes on with Markus Eremita, Evagrius, Ammonius, Theodore and ends with our Lord himself. The two definitions from Theodore seem to come from the same source as in I 36 (Explanation of the Lord's Prayer). The first definition uses the "participation" which is again very characteristic of Theodore.

VII 14 (p. 99 verso). Dadisho makes some interesting remarks on the hermeneutics of Theodore which are not explained quite correctly by Draguet. Dadisho says: "It is right to notify the reader also of this: the blessed Theodore, the Interpreter, because he did historical interpretation as it was fitting and advantageous for all together,

did not explain spiritually ܐܝܬܬܝܒܐ as the hermit fathers (do), except (in) a few (passages), as 'Blessed are the pure of heart, because they shall behold God' (Mt. 5,8) and

'Who loves me and keeps my commandments, my Father will love him and I shall also love him and I shall show myself to him' (John 14, 15. 21. 23) and others similar; he knew that few are those who reach the purity of heart and deserve divine revelations." Draguet in his notes on 13 and 14 on p. 99 does not give the cross references to I 36 and 37; instead he refers to a passage from the Commentary on John and another from the Catechetical Homilies and adds to the latter: "where however the commentary on these verses does not seem to go beyond the historical interpretation." But Dadisho has nothing else in mind than the explanations he has quoted in I 36 and 37. From all what he says it is evident that he considers them to be a description of the spiritual life, of the life of the solitaries and that he *therefore* calls them spiritual interpretations. When Dadisho in VII 14 says: Theodore "knew that *few* are those who reach the purity of heart and deserve divine revelations," he is alluding to the Theodore quotation in I 36 *and* drawing a conclusion which for Dadisho is a matter of course: those few are the solitaries.

"Spiritual interpretation" then as understood by Dadisho means: texts like the verses quoted being applied to the life of perfection led only by the solitaries.

The continuation of the passage just discussed confirms this. Dadisho cites from and refers to explanations of 2 Cor. 3,13 and 3,18 by Theodore. Theodore is reported to have said that "from glory to glory" means the pledge of the Spirit received in [78] baptism ("from glory") and the glorification which the saints will receive *in heaven* ("to glory"). But that is not considered sufficient: "But abbas Isaiah and the other solitary fathers explain these phrases spiritually as is indicated above," that is to say in VII 11 and VII 14. One would surmise that the passages from St. Paul are highly spiritual by themselves and that Theodore's eschatological explanations are no less so, but no. The spiritual explanation "indicated above" postulates the glorification,

accomplished in heaven after the resurrection according to Theodore and St. Paul, as something to be given *now, on earth*, in this life, *to the saints*.

XI 2 (p. 112 versio). In a small collection about the meaning of the cross for followers of Christ from Theodore, Basil, Macarius, Evagrius, Isaiah, Theodore's definition is only reported, not quoted; "Theodore the interpreter thus understands it: that one makes oneself die to every wordly business and care, thinks and does only what pleases God and is agreeable to him, supporting all labors and accepting all tribulations for it." The title of the work by Theodore is not given and Draguet could not identify the text in question.

XI 17 (p. 120 versio). Dadisho quotes a saying of Theodore about the effects of Psalm singing. Draguet could not find it in the published fragments of Theodore's commentary on the Psalms, but I do not think that it must necessarily originate from that Commentary. As in VII 14 the remarks of Dadisho following the quotation are very interesting. Theodore says that the Psalms "when they are sung in prayer by holy men in *the right way*, chase demons away from us and let come near the holy angels and the Lord of angels, our Lord Christ." Dadisho takes up "in the right way" and asserts that clearly Theodore by that utterance did not intend his own historical interpretation nor the "hermeneutical" (as Draguet translates ܡܬܝܠܡܢܐ) of Basil and John (Chrysostome). In place of "hermeneutical" translate "homiletic" since ܡܬܝܠܡܢܐ can also have the meaning "to preach," 'homilein' which fits perfectly: both Basil and Chrysostome wrote homilies on the Psalms or had them attributed to their name. The historical explanation is fit for the *eskolayē*, says Dadisho, the homiletical for the secular people. But "the right manner" intended by Theodore is taken by Dadisho to be the spiritual [79] understanding of the Psalms which only the solitaires (see Theodore's "holy men") have while chanting the Psalms. What Dadisho seems to say is that the solitaires are getting a spiritual experience in praying with the words of the Psalms: or perhaps even that the Psalms in a special manner apply only to them; he cannot mean spiritual explanation in the sense of a written work.

XIV (p. 160 versio). Here again Theodore appears together with a collection of sayings from the fathers of the desert. The subject is now the kingdom of God. The main interest of Dadisho is to harmonize the eschatological thrust, so characteristic of Theodore, with the certainty of the solitaires to behold the heavenly light here and now for which the story of the transfiguration Christ is the main testimony from the gospel. Theodore is quoted with an explanation of Luke 17, 21 (a text not known before) and another quotation (on p. 161) (also unknown).

Christ's announcing the approach of the kingdom of heaven is understood by the *teachers* as concerning the kingdom to come, by reason of the "cabs" of the story. But the solitary fathers explain the announcement *spiritually*: "If you do penitence at once as is fitting then at once immediately you will enjoy within you, *down here on earth*, the kingdom of heaven in a manifestation of light, through the power of the Holy Spirit" (XIV 5 p. 162 versio).

Discourse XV contains quite a number of quotations from the blessed Interpreter. The subject of the treatise is the fate of the soul after death, this is treated at considerable length. Theodore teaches the sleep of the souls in paradise until the last judgement, which goes against the grain with Dadisho. On the other hand Theodore distinguishes between paradise and heaven, and with this against an opinion, attributed above (XV 18 beginning, cf. also XV 12 n. 16) to Mani, Origen and Didymus, according to which ... the souls are sleeping like the bodies".

XV 13 (p. 204 versio) tries to solve the problem where the just are dwelling after leaving their bodies, and whether they are able to feel and to praise in this state. As usual a collection of opinions and quotations is presented, beginning with Theodore and going on with several desert fathers. Theodore's opinion is, [80] so Dadisho tells us, that the souls of the just, when they leave the world, go and enter paradise. A quotation from the Interpreter's Commentary on the Gospel is given, evidently unknown. Dadisho does not say which Gospel, but because of the word from the crucified Christ to the robber (Luke 23, 43) which is the text to be explained we can take it that the Commentary in question is about Luke. In fact, in XV 15 the Commentary on Luke is mentioned. Theodore says in the fragment *inter alia* that the souls of those who love God and therefore shall enjoy the kingdom of heaven after the last judgement, go at the hour of death to the paradise and there they shall be until the hour of judgement in a fitting place.

But when the souls of the just are in paradise, do they behold the Lord in a manifestation of light and do they praise God - or not? (p. 205 versio). This question is treated in XV 14. For Dadisho the answer is yes, they do (p. 206 versio), and he tries to demonstrate this from none other than Theodore. He quotes for this purpose a passage, unknown otherwise, from the Commentary on 2 Corinthians, concerning Paul's rapture into paradise. Paul's expression "The ineffable words" heard in paradise are described by Theodore as words which fit intellectual beings "and *saints which are moved* by the grace of the Spirit". These last words are the operative ones

for Dadisho. He is able to present another passage from Theodore where the operation of the Spirit on the souls of the departed is expressed clearly. The excerpt is from the Treatise on the Holy Spirit (book 6), of which we knew before only the title (from Abdisho). If the just in paradise praise God, they then certainly can also pray and their prayer can assist those who ask the departed for help (XV 15, p. 206 versio). Again Dadisho wishes to demonstrate this from Theodore. And so we get something very interesting and rare indeed: a glimpse of Theodore's personal piety,

but not without an expression of the correct theological foundation of his piety - perhaps the combination is characteristic for the great divine. The quotation is from the "Apology" which precedes the *argumentum* of the Commentary on Luke and was unknown before. Theodore tells us that he has been ill and that he got help in his illness through the office of the blessed Thekla, "of whom we have already received much good, [81] the blessed apostle having always confirmed it by his prayers for us." It is God's will which makes the ministry of the blessed effective, not only during their life on earth but also after their depart from this life, and especially now. - Note the grades of legitimation of the

saint's help: *Thekla's* help is confirmed by the *apostle's* prayers (Paul's of course, the connection of the two is taken for granted), and it is the will of *God* which makes their help possible.

The matter of the prayer of the departed saint is further affirmed by a quotation from Nestorius, about the good fortune to have a friend who has been a saint, is now in paradise and can help by his prayers. - It is a pity that we are not told the source of the fragment which shows as in the case of Theodore an aspect of the thinking of the author we were unaware of before. After this there is a text from Theodoret's *Historia religiosa* and sayings from the desert fathers on the topic of the chapter. The next variant of the subject, treated in XV 16 (p. 208 versio), concerns the question, whether the souls of the just rejoice in paradise - of course they do. Theodore is called as a witness, this time with his book *Against the magoi*, called "Mastubya" after the addressee, again a work known before only by its title from Dadisho; the quotation is located at the end of the work, in the last section. Theodore says that the souls in paradise have a joy which is a pledge (of the final joy). Dadisho wants the reader to look at Theodore's text with special attention, he will then find there the words "joy" and "their joy"; and now he, Dadisho, is going to quote from Theodore "without addition or omission". What Theodore in fact is teaching in the two quotations which follow (p. 208 f. versio) is the doctrine of the sleep of the souls in paradise. In the second quotation (p. 209) the expression "*as in sleep and in repose*" occurs. Dadisho welcomes this as an opportunity to assert, that the words in question do not indicate the cessation of the rational faculty of the souls, but the fact that the souls do not have to struggle any longer for justice as in the miserable state on earth. After citing again an unknown text of Theodore (from a letter, contained in the book called "Pearls") on the "sweet and spiritual sleep", Dadisho insists that Theodore does not use the verb "to sleep", that he does not say "they lie in sleep", but that his expression is "*repose as in sleep*". He constructs [82] a contrast between "sleep" and asserts that sleep is something which belongs to the body and not to the soul.

So Dadisho has now succeeded to harmonize, rather artificially, the intentions of both his authorities, the desert fathers and the Interpreter - but in the sense of the desert fathers. The method he uses is the one he disdained in the *eskolayē*: to look after the words and their meaning - on former occasions he deemed that to be beneath the spiritual level of the solitary and worthy only of the school people. They of course would not have appreciated at all what he did with the exact sense of the Interpreter's words. But we must note on the other hand the evident interest of Dadisho to keep to the authority of Theodore in the realm of a spirituality fed from other sources. To attain this end he is ready to pay the price of reading Theodore in the light of the spirituality he lives in himself and therefore to reinterpret him. But by the same means a number of Theodorian quotations, unknown from other sources, has been preserved for us - a result of this struggle between contrasting loyalties for which we may be grateful.

Additional Note

The book of Dadisho Qatraya on the Abbas Isaiah has a prominent place in a booklength paper by R. Macina in *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 32 (1982) p. 86-124. 263-301; 33(1983) p. 39-103, with the title:

L'homme à l'école de Dieu. D'Antioche à Nisibe: profil herméneutique, théologique et kérygmétique du mouvement scoliaste nestorien. Monographie programmatique.

We note that Macina uses "scoliaste" for *eskolaya* in the same sense as Draguet, that is to say as "belonging to the schools".

For Theodore's veneration of saint Thecla (see above p. 80 f. [here in this volume p.302 f.]), we find another reference in the "Cause of the foundation of schools" by Barhadbeshabba (PO IV 4) (the correct translation of this title should be: "Introductory exposition to the session of the School", Macina 1982 p. 118 n. 27). This reference is quoted by Macina 1982 p. 267 in his own French translation from PO IV 4 p. 379, without a cross-reference to [83] Dadisho. We read in Barhadbeshabba: "And when he was elevated to the episcopate of Mopsuestia, he constantly threw himself on the tomb of saint Thecla and asked (her) help to receive the capability to interpret the scriptures".

The passage from Dadisho XI 17, discussed by me on p. 78 above [here in this volume p. 301], is quoted by Macina p. 289 f. in Draguet's translation including the adjective "hermeneutical", but on his next page Macina explains that *turgama* in this connection is to be understood as "homily".

In his evaluation of Dadisho's use of the spiritual sense of the scriptures Macina is not specific enough. The generalizing conclusions drawn by him and applied to Nestorian biblical interpretation as a whole still have to be tested. The question is whether *all* Nestorian monastic communities were having the special brand of spirituality as represented by Dadisho. The reason why Dadisho is not satisfied with Theodore is the Interpreter's own spirituality (and not only his "historical" exegesis) with its strong eschatological accent: here on earth we participate in the things promised to us in hope and expectation, the fulness of heavenly joy and all perfection awaits us in our life. But the claim of Dadisho's solitaries is that they already see the heavenly light in full and live the life of heaven here on earth - this is to be understood by the "perfection" of the solitary life.

5 Contributions to the history of dogma in the 4th-6th century

5.1 The third Arian discourse of Athanasius Eusebians and Arians and the Western Serdicence

Martin Tetz on his 65th birthday

1 The Kannengiesser thesis

Charles Kannengiesser has repeatedly, most extensively in his book "Athanasius d'Alexandrie, évêque et écrivain. Une lecture des traités Contre les Ariens" (Paris 1983), argued that Athanasius' third treatise against the Arians was not written by the Bishop of Alexandria. He suggests Apollinarius as a possible author. So far, Kannengiesser's opinion does not seem to have met with much approval. But it has already had an effect insofar as Martin Tetz's tentative dating of the bishop's writings for the Arian speeches in his TRE article "Athanasius" shows a chronological differentiation: Oratio I-II 340/341?, Oratio III 345/346? Tetz still had Kannengiesser's thesis in the form of an article from 19751. Tetz sees the "clear terminological distance to the first two speeches etc." emphasized by Kannengiesser as "thematically conditioned", whereby one gets the impression from his remarks at the place mentioned that it is a matter of the incipient Christological debate.

I will first refer to Kannengiesser's account. The third speech has neither a general introduction nor a general conclusion (p. 93); it assumes that the first two speeches are known and refers to them from time to time (p. 93 f.). The technique of composition is scholastic (p. 99). One finds no trace of a reference to the origins of the Arian crisis or historical or concrete memories, as they accompany the textual dossiers [390] in I/II, the opponents remain extraordinary and distant; there is no narrative polemic or pastoral catechesis as in I/II (p. 102). The tone and style in the treatment of doctrinal topics have changed (p. 104).

C. 59 (the beginning of the large section 59-67) initially shows some similarities to the large introductions in I/II (p. 107). In c. 67 there is something like a general conclusion to the third speech, even if it is not as deliberate and coherent as in I/II (p. 109).

In contrast to I/II, Euseb (of Nicomedia) is not mentioned in the third speech (p.121). Arius has disappeared, Asterius is mentioned and quoted twice:

¹ C. Kannengiesser, *Le mystère pascal du Christ selon Athanase d'Alexandrie*, Rech. de science religieuse 63 (1975) p. 407-442 - I would like to thank my assistant Ch. Marksches for the fair copy of this essay.

"Avec le troisième CA, nous restons finalement sur un champ de bataille où l'ennemi doctrinal tend à devenir anonyme, et le combat purement théorique" (p. 127). The Arius' "Thalia" is not mentioned, "ni apparemment 'connue' par l'auteur de CA III", in any case she plays no role in the composition (p. 155). The quotation from Asterius in III 2 (no. IX in Kannengiesser's count of Asterius quotations in the speeches) "could distance us" from the quotations from the Syntagmation that Athanasius brings in I/II. And in III 60 (quotation no. X) Asterius is used in a quite surprising way (p.162). The introductions to these quotations "objectively ignore what had previously been said about Asterius", revealing a new polemical attitude towards the Sophist (p. 165).

The structure of the third discourse is as follows: c. 1-25. 26-58. 59-67. The middle section has long circulated as an independent treatise; "On John 1:14" is the indirect tradition (p. 246). In c. 1-16 it is noticeable that the expositions on divine unity do not show the slightest inclination to any actualization of biblical revelation (p. 247). "Les règles herméneutiques de CA I-II sont comme oubliées, bien qu'on les trouve supposées ailleurs en ce troisième traité et rappelées en des termes nouveaux". "Pas un instant, cet auteur ne songe à discuter vraiment l'opinion qu'il prétend combattre. One is left in a state of almost complete ignorance on the subject of this latter. Les 'ariens' se limitent au rôle de repoussoir théorique pour justifier des variations sur les thèmes d'un exercice de type assez scolaire" (p. 248). In the last chapters of the third speech there are repeated references back to I/II (p. 249). In the middle section (26-58), the Incarnation is presented "not as an event of salvation history, but as a modified state of the Logos, which from now on is in solidarity with the assumed flesh", whereas in I/II it is celebrated and actualized as the main event of our history (p. 250). The "ostensible opponents" are completely passive (p. 251).

The author of the third discourse, although he not only read I/II, but also read it carefully, did not distinguish between the two levels on which Athanasius speaks there, namely the polemic against the excommunicated Christians and the pastoral exhortation to the true recipients of I/II, i.e. the faithful who remained orthodox and who demanded a written testimony from their bishop. In the third discourse, everything becomes more abstract, more scholastic. In addition, there are doctrinal differences, [391] both of which can only be explained by a difference in the author (p. 311). In chapters 1-6, expressions for the Son and the Father appear that are not found in I/II; "d'où aussi la nouveauté du style, avec ses effets de symétrie et ses redondances dues à l'emploi répété des mêmes épithètes; d'où surtout un angle de vue strictement 'théologique' où l'affirmation de Dieu se suffit à elle-même, en sa rigueur conceptuelle, sans aucune allusion à l'expérience concrète de la foi ou à l'histoire du salut" (p. 313). It is important to see the speculative basis of the author's thought; it is a deepened conception of the divine unity from which the divinity of the Son is defended, a theory of the *θεότης* itself, in the context of which the necessary precisions about the

Godhead of the Son (p. 316). The analogies used by Athanasius in I/II for the origin of the Son are rethought and adapted in the third discourse in a way not known from I/II (p. 317). A good stylistic contrast results when Orat. II 51 or 53 with the third speech: "là des propositions sinueuses et complexes qui font appel à l'imagination et suggèrent de méditer sur des réalités narrées; ici des théorèmes et des énoncés de principes, dont la répétition analytique forme et réseau abstrait. La configuration des textes s'en trouve changée" (p. 320 n. 51). The author's ego is bound to the decisions within the theoretical debates (p. 322). III 9 takes up the *πρωτότοκος* of Col. 1,15 "dans une ignorance apparemment complète de l'exposé auquel il s'était prêté en CA II 62-64" (p. 323 n. 57). The author's repetitions show an "indefatigable (and youthful?) rigor" (p. 334). The author also proves to be a theorist in chapters 26-58 (p. 339). His speculative attitude is not simply an addition or correction to I/II (p. 340 f.). The content and form of the exposition remain foreign to the peculiarity of Athanasius of I/II, the author is a different one (p. 341). It is not, as already suggested (n. 86: von Tetz, TRE I.c. p. 345), a different phase of the anti-Arian polemic.

In the 26th chapter of the third speech, the Bible verses put into the mouths of the opponents illustrate the purely "read" (livresque), not to say fictitious, character of the anti-Athanasian polemic; there is no indication of any direct experience. For chapters 32 ff. Kannengiesser observes an inspiration from I/II or from other Athanasian writings (p. 348 f.). C. 67 offers a stylistic exercise that deliberately follows the first discourse; but this does not go beyond a "lointaine relecture", the appropriateness of which is difficult to discern.

After his passage through the third discourse, Kannengiesser considers the distinction between two authors for I/II and III to be "fermement acquise"; it is now only a matter of drawing the more important consequences from this distinction (p. 368). Kannengiesser wants to leave the attribution of the speech to the still young Apollinarius in the *modus interrogationis* until further clarification (p. 413). - So much for my paper.

[392] What Kannengiesser has convincingly succeeded in doing is proving the special position of the third discourse compared to the corpus of I/II. The special position is based above all on a different way of presenting the theological material by the author of the oration; but Kannengiesser's insistence on the abstract, systematic trait in the author's thinking is considerably exaggerated. The unmistakable references to I/II are pointed out, but the obvious references to De incarnatione in the middle part of the third discourse are not specifically mentioned - if one wants to be malicious, one could say that they are concealed. Kannengiesser would probably reply that this is a case of someone else using Athanasius' somewhat older writing. On the other hand, it is worth remembering that Athanasius himself, in the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 362, refers to

c. 30-33 of the third speech.² All this rather suggests that the same author returns to what has already been thought through and formulated on occasion or when necessary, and that a change of authors cannot be postulated in between.

C. Stead complains in his detailed review of Kannengiesser's book,³ that K. makes no reference to the theology of Athanasius' contemporaries or predecessors other than that of the Arians; even the obvious dependence on Markell of Ancyra in the interpretation of Prov. 8,22 is not mentioned.⁴ For the third speech, Kannengiesser himself explicitly claims, as we have seen, the purely theoretical character of the polemic, distance from any concrete situation, complete incomprehensibility of the opponents. However, Kannengiesser's assertion can be refuted, and this also makes relatively precise dating possible.

2 Ctr. Ar. III 59-67: against a formula of the Eusebians

This section is described by Kannengiesser (p. III) as an appendix and overwritten "Contre la thèse de l'origine du Verbe selon la décision et volonté du Père". Athanasius' contested formula of the origin of the Son *βουλήσει καὶ θελήσει* is found twice in the Ekthesis makrostichos (handed down by Athanasius in De synodis 26), once at the end of the long second anathematism, which was appended to the fourth Antiochene Confession for the Synod of Serdica (i.e. in the "Eastern" Anathematism). i.e. in the "Eastern" Serdicense, which Athanasius does not cite specifically in De synodis because it is included in the formula makrostichos anyway),⁵ and secondly in the corresponding section of the explanatory notes to the Anathemata.⁶ At first glance, the question arises as to which of the two statements of the Eusebians Athanasius has in mind in the appendix to the third discourse, the "Eastern" Serdicense or the Formula makrostichos.

Kannengiesser says nothing about the relationship to these texts of the Eusebians. Stead, who criticizes the content of Athanasius' remarks in the appendix to the third discourse,⁷ does not seem to have been aware of them either, otherwise he would have taken the share of the unmitigated

² Cf. M. Tetz, Über nikänische Orthodoxy. The so-called Tomus ad Antiochenos of Athanasius of Alexandria. ZNW 66 (1975) p. 194-222; here p. 214.

³ JThSt NS. 36 (1985) p. 220-229.

⁴ Ibid. p. 225.

⁵ Athanasius cites the fourth Antiochian formula in De synodis 25.

⁶ The word pair "by decision and will" appears in both passages of the Eusebian text in negated form: Whoever says that the Son is not born of the Father by decision and not by will is anathema.

⁷ C. Stead, The freedom of the will and the Arian Controversy in: Platonism and Christianity. Festival schrift Heinrich Dörrie (JAC, Erg. Bd. 10), Münster 1983, p. 243-257; reprinted in C. Stead, Sub-

The author included the polemical motivation in the arguments of the Alexandrian in his judgment (although this judgment would probably not have become any milder as a result). In fact, the cross-reference has long since (1899!) been given by A. Stülcken, albeit with an incorrect evaluation.⁸ Stülcken believes that the relevant ana-thematism of the "Eastern" formula of Serdica⁹ is directed against the Athanasius of Ctr. Ar. III 59-67. For Athanasius does not even indicate there that "he was aware of a synodal formula relating to it. The priority therefore seems to lie with him". For Stülcken, the terminus ad quem for the composition of the speeches is thus the year 343 (i.e. Serdica); and because Athanasius expected the Arians to commit acts of violence only in the future (II 43), they "must have been written before Athanasius' banishment, i.e. 339". Stülcken rightly says that this conclusion is not certain, but he does consider it probable.

In order to clarify the questions, we must search the text of Athanasius for usable evidence. Athanasius provides a transition to the theme of the appendix in the second half of III 58. At the end of the chapter, the opponents are compared to the Hydra: living in enmity with the truth, they "devise innovations" (ἐπινοοῦσι καινότερα) so that they prove themselves to be even more enemies of Christ (Athanasius adopts this expression in the introduction to the formula makrostichos in De synodis: ὡς γὰρ καινότερά τινα ἐπινοήσαντες; from Ctr. Ar. III 58 and 59 it can now be inferred *what is* supposed to be new). C. 59: In spite of all proofs to the contrary, which would have discouraged even the devil, "they again devise and murmur, and to [394] some they whisper, and to others they swarm round them like gnats, saying, 'Be it so: So you explain this and win with your conclusions and proofs; but it must be said that by decision and will the Son came into being from the Father (ἀλλὰ δεῖ λέγειν βουλήσει καὶ θελήσει γεγενῆσθαι τὸν υἱὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς).'" Of course, this could still be interpreted orthodoxly, even if it is said clumsily; but since it is the heretics who say this, the statement is suspect. It must be examined whether they have not, refuted in all things, like the Hydrians, "devised a new expression (καινότερον ἐπενόησαν λεξιίδιον)". "The same is meant by those who say: By decision the Son became, and by those who say: It was once that he was not, and: From the non-existent the Son became and is a creature". Where does the out

stance and illusion in the Christian fathers (Collected Studies 224), London 1985; here p. 225-257 of the original.

⁸ A. Stülcken, *Athanasiana. Litterar- und dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (TU 19,4), Leipzig 1899, p. 47.

⁹ According to the older assumption, Stülcken names Philippopolis as the meeting place of the "eastern" synod. - A useful overview of the history of attempts to date the Arian speeches is provided by E. Mout-

soulas: *Τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς χρονολογήσεως τῶν "Τριῶν κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν" λόγων τοῦ μεγάλου Ἀθανασίου*, *Θεολογία* 47 (1976) p. 542-557. 674-692. Moutsoulas dates the speeches to ca. 338 (p. 692).

I owe the reference to Stülcken to this essay: p. 550.

print βουλήσει καὶ θελήσει or from which scripture (γραφὴ) do they bring this up again?¹⁰

In c. 60 there is a quotation from Asterius (as already in III 2). C. 61 repeats the identification of βουλήσει and ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. Opponents should be content to say only the latter.

C. 62 has preserved for us a genuine argument of the opponents: "If he did not become by determination, then God got his Son by necessity and not as a Wollender (εἰ μὴ βουλήσει γέγονεν, οὐκοῦν ἀνάγκη καὶ μὴ θέλων ἔσχεν ὁ θεὸς υἱόν). To this sentence is to be compared Formula makrostichos VIII: Whoever says impiously that the Son was begotten οὐ βουλήσει οὐδὲ θελήσει, let him ascribe to God ἀνάγκην δὲ δηλονότι ἀβούλητον καὶ ἀπροαίρετον, ἵνα ἄκων γεννήσῃ τὸν υἱόν. This is beyond all κοινὰ ἔννοιαι about God and beyond the will of the inspired Scriptures.

The idea that the Son comes from the will of the Father is an old topos of logos theology, and even Athanasius concedes (c. 59) that it can be understood correctly. However, it is also clear from his remarks that the opponents have *now* "thought up" the catchy formulation βουλήσει καὶ θελήσει. There can be no question against Stülcken that this formulation comes from Athanasius and that the Formula makrostichos and even before that the "Eastern" Serdicense only react to it.

Even if Athanasius' statements only come to life for us in their concrete reference against the background of these two texts, the second half of Stülcken's argument must be considered: he, Stülcken, could not find any mention of a formula of faith in Athanasius' text. This is not yet formulated compellingly enough. One must ask more precisely whether Athanasius would have expressed himself as he does if the Eusebian argument of the will had already been available to him in the form of *an anathema*. His description of the opponents' activities seems to me to speak against it. This would then solve my problem as to which of the two Eusebian confessions Athanasius included in the appendix to the [395] third speech. I have wavered several times in answering the question, but because of the remarks about the ἀνάγκη it should have been decided in favor of the formula makrostichos, with corresponding consequences for the dating.

The situation described at the beginning of chapter 59 (see above) shows the opponents engaged in intense diplomatic activity; they want to present their point of view to as many people (or rather: groups) as possible and thus convince them by "murmuring, whispering, humming", i.e. acting both cautiously and persistently. It can hardly be assumed that Athanasius himself was one of the addressees of their efforts, but of course he was aware of them. We must postulate that there was a written exposition by the Eusebians, for what we have described above as the

¹⁰ The formula makrostichos repeatedly argues with scriptural conformity.

Athanasius' rendition of their opinion is quite correct and does not belong to the realm of insinuation and consequentialism, with which polemics so readily work and to which Athanasius immediately switches by trying to impute to the addressees those Arian propositions which they had expressly placed under anathema in the fourth Antiochene formula.

The content of what the opponents want to convey is astonishing; they concede to the other side that it is right - "so be it; so you explain it and *win* with your conclusions and proofs" - (and it is an equally astonishing concession by Athanasius that he tells us this), their only condition is that they emphasize the will aspect with regard to the origin of the Son from the Father (or at least do not want to let it go under). We know the motive for this: the idea of physical compulsion, of a natural process, is to be kept away from the Father. Athanasius' positive explanations show that it would have been possible to reach agreement on this point, but Athanasius destroys this possibility by declaring the Eusebians to be Arians, as already mentioned, and by throwing the will argument together with the Arian key propositions, despite their condemnation by the Eusebians.

What we can infer from Athanasius' statements is an attempt by the Eusebians *before* the Synod of Serdica to come to an agreement with the other side in matters of Trinitarian differences. This attempt was apparently recorded in writing, and Athanasius in turn responded to it, also *before* Serdica.

3 Ctr. Ar. III 1-25 and the "western" Serdicense

The chronological approach just established is confirmed by the references to the contemporary discussion that can be found in the first part of the third discourse, chapters 1-25. First of all, a remark by Athanasius at the beginning of c. 10 should be referred to. The Alexandrian states the view [396] of the opponents: "Since, indeed, what the Father wills, this also the Son wills, and (the Son) contradicts neither the thoughts nor the judgments, but agrees with him in everything (ἀλλ' ἐν πᾶσιν ἐστι σύμφωνος αὐτῷ), by (offering) the ταυτότης of the injunctions (δόγματα) and by presenting discourse consistent and coherent with the Father's teaching".¹¹ Athanasius adds: "Not only to say this, but *also to write it*

¹¹ This text has been listed by G. Bardy (Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche et son école, Paris 1936) as Asterius citation no. XIV, in a series of citations beginning with no. XI, where

Athanasius does not mention Asterius, but seems to allude to him. Kannengiesser, who has closely examined Athanasius' citations in the Arian speeches, rightly did not include the quotation in his own compilation. W. Kinzig (In search of Asterius. Studies on the Authorship of the Homilies on Psalms, Göttingen 1990) counts Bardy's No. XIV as one of the most authentic citations in the world.

some have dared". The content of what is said is reminiscent of the second Antiochian formula, where the trinity of the Godhead is seen in the hypostases, the unity in the συμφωνία.¹² Furthermore, the "western" Serdicense (Theodoret § 45, Loofs/Tetz

§ 913) the interpretation of John 10:30 as oneness διὰ τὴν συμφωνίαν καὶ ὁμόνοιαν. But what Athanasius communicates here is much more explicit, and presumably it is not merely a lecture on what he has in writing, but even a quotation from it. The text he is referring to cannot be identical with one of the Eusebian regulae fidei known to us; it must be a more extensive document.

This allows us to correct a comment by M. Tetz on the debate about John 17:21 in the "Western" Serdicense; Tetz writes: "In the immediate presuppositions of the 'Serdicense' no connection with John 17:21 becomes tangible", which is why he draws on relevant passages from the anti-Marcellan writings of Euseb.¹⁴ However, our previous remarks allow us to refer to chapters 22-25 of Athanasius' third discourse, which are dedicated to the interpretation of John 17:20-23, in *response* to an interpretation of the opponents that must have been available in written form. The same interpretation is rejected in the last section of the Serdicense.

Finally, if we compare the Johannine passages dealt with in III 1-25 with those in the "western" Serdicense, we get the following picture:

[397]

III 1-6 on John 14:10,

serd. § 41 (§ 4): Joh. 14,10; 10,30

In c. 3 and 5: John 10:30;

c. 4: Joh. 17,10

7-16 over Deut. 32,3915

c. 7: Joh. 14,28Serd

. § 45 (§ 8): Joh. 14,28

Serd. § 45. 47 (§ 9. 10): John 10:30

heit of questionable quotations (p. 126), therefore cites it in brackets. The quotation can now be definitively denied to Asterius.

12 J. N. D. Kelly (Altchristliche Glaubensbekenntnisse, Göttingen 1972) quotes on this confession p. 265 Contra Celsum 8, 12 (Koetschau II, 229 f.): (We worship the Father of truth and the Son who is truth) ὄντα δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα, ἔν δὲ τῇ ὁμοιοῖα καὶ τῇ συμφωνίᾳ καὶ τῇ ταυτοτητι τοῦ βουλήματος. Origen affirms beforehand that he does not belong to those who deny the two hypostases Father and Son. - As can be seen, the reference to the Origen passage in the passage that Athanasius quotes in c. 10 as the opinion of the opponents is much closer than in the second Antiochene formula.

13 See the next note.

14 M. Tetz, Ante omnia de sancta fide et de integritate veritatis. Questions of faith at the Synod of Serdica (342), ZNW 76 (1985) p. 243-269; here p. 265.

15 Athanasius does not read, or rather his opponents do not read ἐγὼ εἰμι, but ἐγὼ μόνος, i.e. a text like the one on which the Vulgate version is based (ego sim solus).

17-21 about Joh. 17,11

22-25 on Joh. 17,20-23Serd

. § 50 (§ 12): Joh 17,21

Serd. § 51 (§ 12): Joh. 10,30+17,21

This confirms that Athanasius and the author(s) of the Serdicense deal with the same text of the Eusebians, only a better idea of their argumentation can be gained from the broader presentation of Athanasius: one can see that the passage Deut. 32,39 (in a certain reading) was also part of their repertoire. Among the "immediate presuppositions" of the Serdicense missed by Tetz, we can therefore count that writing of the Eusebians which is to be developed.

For the third Arian discourse, it emerges against Kannengiesser that Athanasius does indeed have to deal with specific opponents, and indeed with new opponents - but he does not do so exclusively, as we will see below. The Alexandrian does not merely combat the new opponents in general, but is directed against written statements by this group. It seems to me that one must postulate *two* writings of the Eusebians, since the part on the question of will (c. 59-67), which Kannengiesser correctly calls an appendix, presupposes an Eusebian initiative of reconciliation (see above), which only followed the previous writing that Athanasius combated in the first part. In the "western" Serdicense this was not (or no longer?) reflected.

The Serdicense is surprisingly long for a *regula fidei* and is also notoriously confusing. This becomes somewhat more understandable when one realizes that not only is one's own point of view presented with polemical acuity, but that at the same time the Eusebian interpretation of the most important biblical passages for the unity of the Godhead had to be rejected. The third element that contributes to the complication, and that extends into the form of the text, are statements by Valens and Ursacius, mentioned right at the beginning (§ 38 / § 3). Incidentally, their specific keywords do not appear in the third speech of Athanasius, so that the [398] Serdicense also has a segment of polemic for itself, like Athanasius with regard to the question of will. This probably has to do with the writings of the opposing party or parties known at the time of writing.

We now turn first to the polemic against Ursacius and Valens in the Sericense before returning to our observations on the third Arian speech.

4 Ursacius and Valens on the suffering of Logos and Spirit and the text of the Serdicense

In this section I will unfortunately be forced to contradict the addressee of my dedication several times.

As a statement of Valens and Ursacius, the Serdicense informs us (§ 38/§ 3) "that the Logos and the Spirit were pierced¹⁶ and slain¹⁷ and died and rose again"; they also speak of three hypostases. The authors, on the other hand, confess the one divine hypostasis (§ 39/§ 4). From the discussion of the time, the question arises against or in view of this doctrine: "What is (then) the hypostasis of the Son?" (§ 40 - thus correctly dividing the Theodoret edition, whereas Loofs/Tetz allow their § 4 to continue). Answer: It is the only (sc. hypostasis) of the Father, - Tetz, on the other hand, reads: "<not> only that of the Father". But the insertion of the μή cannot be justified; Athanasius' answer would also have been (with deliberately different terminology): the Son's being is the οὐσία of the Father (see below). The Serdicense's justification for the answer to the question about the hypostasis of the Son is: the Father has never been without the Son and the Son has never been without the Father; and this is then impressed once again in the next sentence: "Most absurd (ἀτοπώτατον) namely is ...". Tetz, however, does not read "without the Father" in the sentence just referred to, but, assuming a wrong abbreviation resolution, "without the Spirit". But this conjecture is untenable in view of the repetitive imprinting of the arguments in the next sentence. Tetz has been influenced by the mention of the whole Trinity in the beginning of his § 4 and also, as he himself says,¹⁸ by the group of words that precedes the just-mentioned ἀτοπώτατον: ὁ ἐστι λόγος πνεῦμα. As a better text, Tetz suggests: ὅστι ἐστι λόγος πνεῦμα, which establishes a connection with the rest of the text. I consider this to be a futile labor of love; rather, the whole thing is a falsely explanatory gloss on "son" that has [399] wrongly entered the text,¹⁹ ὁ ἐστι corresponds to an explanatory τοῦτ' ἐστι. I therefore read Theodoret p. 113,17-114,1 Parmentier thus:

μηδὲ υἱὸν χωρὶς πατρὸς γεγενῆσθαι μηδὲ εἶναι δυνάσθαι [ὁ ἐστι λόγος πνεῦμα]. ἀτοπώτατον γὰρ ἐστι ...

¹⁶ I follow Loofs/Tetz in my reading of this word.

¹⁷ Sic, singular, as well as the following verbs.

¹⁸ Tetz p.254 c-c: "The whole passage must be understood and reconstructed from its end. the."

¹⁹ Perhaps the gloss originally referred to "son" in the question "What is the hypostasis of the son?"

The gloss was written under the impression of the Ursacius Valens opinion on logos and spirit, which is not very far back in the text, but which is not yet dealt with here.

This only happens in § 48 (§ 11). Here a confession of the Holy Spirit is first expressed, followed by a confession of the Incarnation. The problem is in which colon of the text, which is difficult in its present form, the transition between the two loci takes place. The train of thought looks like this: We believe in the Paraclete, the ἅγιον πνεῦμα, whom the Lord promised and sent to us, ἐπεμψεν, καὶ τοῦτο πιστεύομεν πεμφθέν, - but Tetz leaves this last colon!²⁰ The text continues: καὶ τοῦτο οὐ πέπονθεν - whereupon Tetz now gets into trouble with the neutral τοῦτο because of the following Christological colon. The two Greek colons together make excellent sense, especially in view of the statements of Ursacius and Valens given at the beginning. The point was that the Spirit also made statements about suffering, namely about suffering in the sense of the Passion of Christ (because the divine in Christ was described as Logos *and* Spirit). Here in our § 48 it is tacitly assumed that the Spirit is not to be spoken of christologically but pneumatologically. It is explicitly stated that the sending of the Spirit, seen from the Spirit, is a being sent, it is an experience of the Spirit in the sense that the verbum can be constructed in the passive. But this does not mean that the Spirit suffers in the way that Christ suffered before the cross and on the cross.

The next colon, ἀλλ' ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃν ἐνεδύσατο belongs to the area of the The text of Tetz's text is not to be found in the manner of Tetz. But the solution to the text-critical and content-related problems is not to be sought in the manner of Tetz, but can most likely be explained (and again with regard to Ursacius and Valens) by the loss of an entire colon due to homoioteleuton. And this "same end" cannot have been anything other than οὐ πέπονθεν; the question is what the (divine) subject of the sentence was called. According to the following lines, θεός would be conceivable, but in a refutation of Ursacius and Valens one would rather expect ὁ λόγος. The text is therefore not to be cured by deleting one colon and changing the next, but by introducing another colon, which has dropped out [400] <καὶ ὁ λόγος οὐ πέπονθεν>, while retaining both. Theodore p. 117.5 f. Parmentier is to be read:

καὶ τοῦτο (sc. τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα) πιστεύομεν πεμφθέν, καὶ τοῦτο οὐ πέπονθεν, <καὶ ὁ λόγος οὐ πέπονθεν>, ἀλλ' ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃν ἐνεδύσατο.

I take this opportunity to add further improvements to the text, although the changes are not related to the subject of the Spirit. It concerns the confession of the titles of the Son μονογενής and πρωτότοκος (§ 44/§ 7).

²⁰ He justifies this with the findings of Gregory of Elvira, l. c. p. 257 o-o.

Loofs had lightened the text in one minor detail and correctly improved an important vocabulary item; Tetz adopted Loofs' text. The Serdicense first explains "only-begotten": this is the Logos, he is everywhere and in the Father. "Firstborn", on the other hand, means the human being (in Christ). Theodoret reads it like this: τὸ πρωτότοκος δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. Διαφέρει δὲ τῇ κοινῇ κτίσει, because he (is) also firstborn from the dead. Loofs deletes the period, replaces the second δέ with καί and corrects κοινῇ to κοινῇ. This last correction is excellent, corresponds entirely to Markell's views and is therefore also approved by Scheidweiler (in the addendum). On the other hand, I am in favor of retaining a clause separator and the δέ and additionally posit that a first διαφέρει before the clause separator has been dropped by haplography. The following chiastic construction can be assumed: τὸ πρωτότοκος δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ <διαφέρει>, διαφέρει δὲ τῇ κοινῇ κτίσει, ὅτι καὶ πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν.²¹ Markell's preference for the construction of διαφέρειν with the dative is well known - incidentally, this seems to me to be a strong argument for the assumption of a Greek original for the "western" Serdicense;²² a translation from Latin would hardly have brought Markell's peculiarity to light.

Finally, in § 39 (§ 4) οἱ αἰρετικοί should be deleted. It is a gloss, just like "graeci" in the Latin translation. The Latin translation has obviously not yet read the Greek gloss.²³ Of course, αὐτοί, ipsi, are the opponents, so οἱ αἰρετικοί is not a false gloss (the Latin gloss is not false, but it is not accurate either). However, the Greek gloss is highly misleading: it suggests that the [401] synonymity of ὑπόστασις and οὐσία is heretical,²⁴ but there can be no question of this at this time - Athanasius would otherwise also be hit with this accusation! The text without the gloss means neither that the opponents prefer the vocabulary οὐσία to ὑπόστασις²⁵ (a

²¹ So to read for Theodoret p. 115,14-116,1 Parmentier.

²² H. C. Brennecke orally: according to the composition of the synod, a double original version can be assumed, Greek and Latin. K. Seibt, who has just completed a dissertation on Markell of Ankyra, also argues that the Greek original of the Western Serdicense has been preserved in Theodoret (oral).

²³ Theodoret p. 113,13 f. Parmentier must read: ... ὑπόστασιν, ἣν αὐτοὶ [οἱ αἰρετικοί] οὐσίαν προσαγορεύουσι. The Latin translation must be read: substantiam, quam ipsi [graeci] <u>sian appellant. The u in <u>sian is Turner's addition. Schwartz also reads: substantiam, quam ipsi οὐσίαν appellant, see Scheidweiler's supplement to p.113.13 Parmentier with reference to [E. Schwartz, Der griechische Text der Kanones von Serdika,] ZNW 30 (1931) [p. 1-35, here] p. 7 [- the ed.].

²⁴ Loofs and, in his wake, Tetz (l.c. p. 261) have succumbed to this suggestion. What Tetz says about the word

The exchange between Ossius and Narcissus about the number of Trinitarian οὐσῆαι does not concern the offensiveness of the vocabulary οὐσῆαι, but the offensiveness of a plurality of οὐσῆαι, be it two (Father and Son) or three (Father, Son, Spirit). The scandal would have been no less if one had spoken of hypostases instead.

²⁵ It might seem as if it was Narcissus who preferred the vocabulary οὐσῆαι. But the choice of words is undoubtedly determined by the question of Ossius.

such a preference can also be observed in Athanasius); or "they themselves" is to be understood in the sense of "even they themselves" and would then indicate agreement between the authors and their opponents with regard to the synonymy of οὐσία and ὑπόστασις - which would bring us to the opposite of what Loofs and Tetz assume.

5 Athanasius and the hypostasis controversy

If one considers how close the chronological proximity of Athanasius' third Arian discourse and the two Serdician confessions is, then it is surprising how Athanasius behaves in the controversial question of hypostases: he almost completely renounces the Trinitarian use of the vocabulary. This applies not only to the third discourse, but to his writings in general.²⁶ In the third discourse he does not advocate *a* divine hypostasis with Markell, as the "Western" Serdicense does; nor does he oppose the three divine hypostases like Markell and the Serdicense, but of course he is not in favor of *three* hypostases in the Trinity either.²⁷ The [402] disavowal of the Serdicense in the Tomus ad Antiochenos of 362, in the

26 In Müller's Lexicon Athanasianum, compare the brevity of the article ὑπόστασις and the length of the article οὐσία: the first keyword fills one column, but a quarter of it is Müller's explanations; the second keyword takes up more than three columns. The right impression of the relationships However, you can only gain a better understanding of the φύσις if you also consider the frequency of φύσις (1.a. natura divina: more than two columns).

27 An indirect indication of Athanasius' relationship to the hypostasis problem can be found in the complex of "Dionys" quotations (on the lack of authenticity of these texts, see L. Abramowski, Dionys von Rom († 258) and Dionys von Alexandrien († 264/5) in den arianischen Streitigkeiten des 4th century. ZKG 93 [1982] p. 240-272) [English version in L. Abramowski, Formula and Context. Studies in Early Christian Thought, Variorum, Hampshire 1992, no. XI, pp.1-35 - *the editor*]. "Dionys of Rome", quoted by Athanasius in De decretis 26, speaks of three hypostases in a pejorative form: they appear as "divided" and as "three deities", as the abolition of monarchia, as three gods, as "three mutually alien hypostases" that separate the holy Monas, they are compared to Marcion's three principles. The triad is of course taught by Scripture, but not three gods. Twice the triad is called "divine" (Opitz p. 22,10 and 23,15). "Dionys of [p. 402] Alexandria" refers to this; he sees in the characterization of the three hypostases as "divided" an ill will of the opponents that the triad can only be preserved with three hypostases. It is significant that this text was not preserved by Athanasius, but by Basil, De spiritu sancto 29,72: εἰ τῷ τρεῖς εἶναι τὰς ὑποστάσεις, μερισμέναι εἶναι λέγουσι, τρεῖς εἰσι κἀν μὴ θέλωσιν, ἢ τὴν θείαν τριάδα παντελῶς ἀνελέτῳσαν. Basil cites yet another sentence of the Alexandrian Dionys, in which the divinity of the Trinity is heightened: Θειοτάτη γάρ, διὰ τοῦτο, μετὰ τὴν μονάδα καὶ ἡ τριάς. It is a pity that the reasoning to which διὰ τοῦτο refers is not provided. - Athanasius has thus quoted a negative presentation of the three-hypostasis doctrine (it appears to be Arian: the Son is a creature), but has omitted the corrective answer to it (it would have to have been mediately Eusebian). It should also be noted that Dionys of Rome speaks well Markellian of Monas, but *not* of a hypostasis.

The fact that this is a highly realistic assessment of the usefulness of this confession for unification efforts with the non-Aryan representatives of the three-hypostasis doctrine does not mean a change in the Athanasian point of view, at least in terms of terminology.

The extent to which Athanasius avoids speaking of hypostases can be shown by a polemical failure against the Arians, where the terminus would actually have suggested itself, c. 16: the Arians cannot see the creature (meaning the Logos) in the Creator (the Father), "because their φύσεις and ἐνέργειαι are alien and different". Accordingly, he himself speaks of the μία φύσις of Father and Son, c. 4, or of the φυσικὴ ἐνότης of the Son with the Father, c. 20.

But let us first examine the few places where ὑπόστασις occurs in the third speech. C. 1: The Arians understand neither

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| a) τί ἐστὶν ἀληθινὸς πατήρ, | b) καὶ ἀληθινὸς υἱός, |
| a) μήτε τί ἐστὶν ἀόρατον καὶ ἀίδιον, | b) καὶ ἀπαύγασμα αὐτοῦ ἀόρατον, |
| a) μήτε τί ἐστὶν ἀόρατος ὑπόστασις | b) καὶ χαρακτηρ ἀσώματος καὶ εἰκὼν ἀσώματος. |

It is clear from the parallelism that ὑπόστασις here refers to the Father and that the vocabulary is taken from Heb. 1:3 and also directly from Sap. 7:26 (φῶς αἰδίου).

Then we find ὑπόστασις only again in the two penultimate chapters of the third discourse, c. 65 and 66, and again in connection with Heb. 1:3. C. 65: καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἀπόστολος οὐ βουλήσας, ἀλλὰ αὐτῆς τῆς πατρικῆς οὐσίας ἴδιον ἀπαύγασμα καὶ χαρακτηρ τὸν υἱὸν κηρύττει, λέγων: (Heb. 1,3)- εἰ δέ, ὡς προειρήκαμεν, ἐκ βουλήσεως οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ πατρικὴ οὐσία καὶ ὑπόστασις, εὐδελον, ὡς οὔτε τὸ ἴδιον τῆς πατρικῆς ὑποστάσεως ἐκ βουλήσεως ἂν εἴη. ὅποια γὰρ ἦ καὶ ὡς ἐὰν ἦ μακαρία ἐκείνη ὑπόστασις, τοιοῦτον καὶ οὕτως εἶναι καὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξ αὐτῆς γέννημα δεῖ. And in c. 66 we read: ὥπερ γὰρ τῆς ἰδίας ὑποστάσεως ἐστὶ θελητής (sc. ὁ πατήρ), οὕτω καὶ ὁ υἱός, ἴδιος ὢν αὐτοῦ τῆς οὐσίας, οὐκ ἀθέλητός ἐστιν αὐτῷ. ὑπόστασις is thus used [403] only in three chapters of 68, referring only to the Father and only as a quotation from or clear allusion to Heb. 1:3. As expected, the vocabulary can be equated with οὐσία, so c. 65 and 66, but this still does not mean that on other occasions ὑπόστασις would stand in for οὐσία. The most common usage is that of οὐσία or φύσις. This is of course no coincidence - but what is Athanasius' motive for this particular selection from the existing vocabulary? To explain this, we must first recall that Alexander of Alexandria, in the Confession of the Synod of Antioch 324/5, proceeds in exactly the same way as Athanasius with regard to ὑπόστασις, and this after Alexander had until then been able to speak very well of the hypostasis of the Son (and could also set φύσις for ὑπόστασις!). The constellation of theological and church-political factors that led to Alexander's abstinence on the hypostasis question at that synod

28 had shifted slightly in the meantime, but had not changed in some basic positions. The almost absolute preponderance of οὐσία in Athanasius is, however, determined by the Nicene: the origin of the Son "from the οὐσία of the Father"; the rejection of the origin "from another ὑπόστασις or οὐσία" - these are the statements he is guided by. And it is clear that for Athanasius the sentence of rejection was to be supplemented by "as that of the Father". Neither of the two vocabularies is used of *the Son* in the Nicene; with regard to οὐσία Athanasius occasionally goes further (see below). The well-known incantations of Athanasius to adhere to the Niceneum mean above all (in addition to the self-evident anti-Arianism) the restraint in vocabulary given there; one should therefore desacralize these incantations somewhat. Although the Bishop of Alexandria did not ultimately prevail with his restraint in the Trinitarian nomenclature, as the Nicene formula shows, at least the Nicene party was not committed to Markell's one Trinitarian hypostasis, and that is the merit of Athanasius.

The well-known favorite expression of Athanasius both for the separation of the Son and for the closest relationship of the Son to the Father is ἴδιον γέννημα τοῦ πατρὸς or τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς or simply τὸ ἴδιον τῆς οὐσίας (some examples in the quotations from c. 65 and 66 above). There is no need to cite evidence for this; the first two Arian discourses already know the formulations. The expression was developed as a counterpart to the Arian κτίσμα and to the "strangeness" of the nature of the Logos in relation to the Father, which Athanasius accuses the Arians of. Müller's Lexicon lists almost two columns of evidence for the "intima inter personas divinas conjunctio et unitas" under "ἴδιος III" (of course, it is better not to speak of "conjunctio" because that itself can be a terminus technicus; "unitas" is of course entirely appropriate).

[404] In the third discourse, Athanasius deals somewhat more specifically with the problem of unity and difference in the Trinity. The occasion is the Eusebian definition (going back to Origen) of the unity of the Trinitarian person as "identity (ταυτότης) of mind", see above in section 3 the key words quoted by Athanasius. Athanasius adopts the concept of ταυτότης, c.

3. 4. 22. (23)²⁹. 36, but finds it in the essence. The counter-concept in the form of ἐτερότης is missing, but the matter is not entirely, for c. 4 Athanasius states how ἕτερον and ταύτόν can be applied to the Son: he is *another* as generated, but

²⁸ Cf. L. Abramowski, Die Synode von Antiochien 324/5 und ihr Symbol, ZKG 86 (1975) p. 356-366 [English version in L. Abramowski, Formula and Context. Studies in Early Christian Thought, Variorum, Hampshire 1992, no. III, pp. 1-12 - *the editor*].

²⁹ Athanasius says in III 23 that the λέξις (= vocabulary) καθώς (i.e. the comparison) is not a ταυτότης and ἰσότης, but imply different things (ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο).

the same as God,³⁰ - note the neuter! The identity lies in the Godhead, and the Godhead is an οὐσία or φύσις: c. 3 ταυτότης τῆς θεότητος, ἐνότης τῆς οὐσίας explain each other, cf. c. 4: ταυτότης τῆς μιᾶς θεότητος. C. 22: the Logos has ταυτότης τῆς φύσεως with the Father, which distinguishes him from us, in whom Christ is also (John 17:23 "I in them"). From the indistinguishable ὁμοιότης and ταυτότης of Father and Son one must not conclude, as Sabellius does, that the Son is the Father, says c. 36³¹. On account of his being ὁμοιότης with the Father he has eternally what he has from him (the Father), on account of his being Son he has from the Father what he has eternally (ibid.).

Among the enumerated passages on identity, the most important is c. 3 (end) - 4. C. 3: Christ rightly says first: "I and the Father are one" (John 10:30), and then adds: "I in the Father and the Father in me" (John 14:10). 14:10), ἵνα τὴν μὲν ταυτότητα τῆς θεότητος, τὴν δὲ ἐνότητα τῆς οὐσίας δείξῃ. C. 4 continues: ἔν γὰρ εἰσιν - and then refutes possible misunderstandings about the nature of unity, including (as later in c. 36) that of Sabellius, "who was condemned as a heretic". ἀλλὰ δύο μὲν εἰσιν - and this is followed by an explicit rejection of identification theology. μία δὲ ἡ φύσις, for the begotten is not unlike the begetter, it is his image, everything that belongs to the Father belongs to the Son. διὸ οὐδὲ ὁ ἄλλος θεὸς υἱός, he is not devised from outside, not a ξένη θεότης alongside that of the Father. εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἑτερόν ἐστιν ὡς γέννημα ὁ υἱός, ἀλλὰ ταυτόν ἐστιν ὡς θεός. τῇ ιδιότητι καὶ οἰκειότητι τῆς φύσεως καὶ τῇ ταυτότητι τῆς μιᾶς θεότητος as has (already) been said. The reflection too is light, and (indeed) not a second (in relation) to the sun, nor by participation in it, but entirely as its ἴδιον γέννημα [405] (the significatum has thus entered the significans, but this arises so easily because "reflection" in Athanasius is practically a name for the Son). Such a γέννημα is necessarily *a* light (one would actually have to expect: a light *with the sun*). And let it not be said that these are two lights; the sun and the reflection are indeed two (see above about Father and Son), but one is the light that illuminates everything in the reflection. Therefore the divinity of the Son is that of the Father, and therefore also inseparable (ἀδιαίρετος), and so one God and so is no other beside him. Because they are one and their deity one, the same statements are made about the Son as about the Father, apart from the Father title itself. This is done with biblical evidence for the names God, Pantocrator, Lord, Light and for the forgiveness of sins.

30 The rejection of ἕτερος at the end of

c. 6. In the last third of the chapter Athanasius quotes monotheistic Old Testament statements and postulates: οὐκ εἰς ἀναίρεσιν δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ λέγεται. He attempts a proof and concludes: So (this) is not said because of him (sc. because of the Son), ἀλλ' εἰς ἀναίρεσιν τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἕτερον, οἷός ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ὁ τούτου λόγος. Lampe PGL gives as translation for ἀναίρεσις in the first place "exclusion", which is especially helpful for the second place and better than "abolitio" in the Lexicon Athan. for both places. BKV makes do with "custody" in the second place.

31 Western Serdicense also rejects identification theology.

As far as I can see, the passage quoted twice above is the only one in the third speech where ἕτερον is used positively in the relation son-father. The intention is anti "Sabellian", thus safeguarding the ταυτότης against misunderstandings. While a substantive abstract is available for identity and unity (θεότης) and unity is presented as one of the φύσις and οὐσία, at first glance there is nothing comparable for the *difference of the Son*, although *this must be taken for granted*. We have already seen that ὑπόστασις is only said of the Father and only because of Heb. 1:3. πρόσωπον is used neither in the third discourse nor otherwise for any of the Trinitarian persons. Once in the third discourse we find ὑπαρξίς for the existence of the Son (among the few instances of the vocable in the genuine Scriptures it is the only one), c. 6: The Son is what kind (οἶος) the Father is, because he has all that is the Father's; therefore he is included under "Father". No one would say "Father" μὴ ὑπάρχοντος υἱοῦ. The situation is different with "Creator" and "creature": the Creator is the Creator even before the creatures. But whoever says Father immediately means καὶ τὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ ὑπαρξιν with the Father.

In the same chapter 6 we come across what seems to me to be a very rare use of οὐσία, namely to the Son himself: "What is said about the Father is said about the Son, not because it comes to τῇ οὐσίᾳ αὐτοῦ by grace or participation, but because the Son's very being is the Father's own generated being". The οὐσία of the Son³² should here mean his essence; since the "unity of essence" of Father and Son is placed by Athanasius, the οὐσία of the Son must then mean his divinity.

In chapters 3-6, Athanasius speaks several times of τὸ εἶναι τοῦ υἱοῦ³³ - is that synonymous with οὐσία or ὑπαρξίς? One must try to determine this [406] with the help of the context. Interpreting John 14:10 ("I in the Father and the Father in me"), Athanasius explains in c. 3 how the two parts of this saying are to be understood. In the explanation of the first part, τὸ εἶναι τοῦ υἱοῦ occurs twice: It is the Son in the Father, as is permitted to think, ἐπειδὴ σύμπαν τὸ εἶναι τοῦ υἱοῦ, τοῦτο τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας ἰδιὸν ἐστίν, as from the light the reflection and from the source the flow, so that he who sees the Son sees τὸ ἴδιον of the Father and recognizes that τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ εἶναι, being *from* the Father, is thus *in the* Father. After the explanation of the second part of the saying, the conclusion is drawn: In that τὸ εἶναι τοῦ υἱοῦ is the εἶδος and the θεότης of the Father, it follows that the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son. - It therefore follows that the question of the content of the formulation τὸ εἶναι τοῦ υἱοῦ cannot be answered with an either-or, with "essence" or "existence"

³² Müller, Lex. Ath. does not seem to have a separate lemma for it. In the article οὐσία there is a passage in section 4b β ("una eademque οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς est in λόγῳ - filio...") with ἡ τοῦ υἱοῦ οὐσία - but this is in the quotation from Theognost in De decretis.

³³ III 60 speaks of τὸ εἶναι τοῦ λόγου (BKV: "of the Son") and places this after ἐκ βουλήσεως and πεποιθῆσθαι against. - In a quotation from "Dionys of Alexandria" [406] in De sententia Dionysii 15,1 we find: The Son has not of himself, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχει τὸ εἶναι (Opitz p, 57.3).

but in a peculiarly Athanasian way both are meant at the same time: the distinctiveness of the Son and his unity with the Father. The Son is εἶδος, which is to be understood analogously to εἰκών³⁴ - this indicates his distinction from the Father; but he is also θεότης and thus the unity is expressed. The same applies to the next evidence, c.5 (at the very end): Since indeed the Son is εἰκών of the Father, it is logical ("by necessity") to recognize "that the Godhead and the ιδιότης of the Father is the εἶναι of the Son." Here it should probably not be translated as "ownership", but rather as "property", in the sense of ἴδιον γέννημα as a designation for the Son. Athanasius understands the definition he has just given as an explanation (καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν) of Phil. 2,6a ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων and the ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἐμοί from Joh. 14:10. If μορφή is to be taken synonymously with "image", then the first biblical passage proves the distinction of the Son from the Father, the second the unity of both. "Form of the Godhead" is not a part of the Godhead, says Athanasius (c. 6, at the beginning), "but πλήρωμα of the Godhead of the Father is the εἶναι of the Son, and the Son is fully God". This is intended to ward off a possible misunderstanding that could arise from the distinction between Father and Son.

On the whole, one can judge that Athanasius gives an answer to the question of the Son's mode of existence, which the author(s) of the Serdicense also faced, that corresponds exactly to his middle position between the representatives of the two different hypostasis theologies. He could not use the vocabulary hypostasis for this purpose, because he would undoubtedly have committed himself to one side or the other. Although, as already mentioned, one is entirely dependent on the context for the content of the expression "the being of the Son", it [407] also results from the fact that Athanasius has thus gone beyond the unsatisfactory state that is given with his favorite word of the "own begotten of the essence of the Father", where the unity of the derived with its origin is to be expressed by the concept of the proper, of belonging. Kannengiesser is quite right when he states that these parts of the third discourse are argued on a different level than in the first two discourses - the confrontation with the Eusebians at a time when they were seeking a balance made this unavoidable. The attacks on the creatureliness of the Son directed against the Arians were not enough in this situation.

³⁴ The biblical evidence for εἶδος = figure, analogous to μορφή and εἰκών, is not provided until several chapters later, namely c. 16: it is Gen. 32:32 LXX, where εἶδος τοῦ θεοῦ stands for Pniel.

6 Ctr. Ar. III 26: A biblical argumentation of the Arians

Now that we have seen that the first and last parts of the speech do not apply to the Arians, but to the Eusebians, it would be obvious to classify the long middle section in the same frontline position. However, this would lead to a distorted judgment of the middle section, because chapters 26 to 58 are actually directed against the Arians.³⁵ Although Kannengiesser refers to them as "Arians" in quotation marks (see his table of contents and p. 344, for example), for him they are only "contradictors sur commande" (p. 344). The biblical passages that form the basis of Athanasius' treatise were virtually put into the mouths of the Arians by him: "Plus que toute autre documentation de ce genre en CA III - et il est vrai qu'elle n'y occupe jamais qu'une place minime -, la collection des versets bibliques placés ici dans la bouche des adversaires illustre le caractère purement livresque, pour ne pas dire fictif, de la polémique anti-arienne conduite par l'auteur de ce traité." There can be no question of any fiction. What Athanasius presents as the argumentation of the Arians is carefully constructed and filled with the most effective New Testament biblical passages - Athanasius himself would never have taken the trouble to present such useful material to his opponents. For his part, it takes an unprecedented amount of effort to deal with the biblical objections of his opponents. It is conceivable, however, that he is presenting us with an abridged presentation, but it cannot be doubted that all these biblical passages and the conclusions drawn from them were presented by the Arians. If it had been Athanasius' own compilation, he would have followed the given order of quotations in his refutation, but he does not. In III 26, we have before us at least one quotation, and in places probably also a quotation from an Arian [408] text. At the beginning of the chapter, this text takes up the Athanasian formula ὁμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν, which is used in speeches I/II,³⁶ and quotes the athanasia-

³⁵ Calculated by the number of chapters, the weights in the third speech are precisely distributed: 25-58 = 34 chapters against the Arians, 1-24. 59-67 = 33 chapters against the Eusebians.

³⁶ The oldest evidence for ὁμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν is Alexander of Alexandria's letter to all bishops, Ἐνὸς σώματος, document 4 b in Opitz. C. Stead has recently, taking up older opinions, argumentates that this letter was written by Athanasius, who is writing here on behalf of his bishop: C. Stead, Athanasius' earliest written work, JThSt NS. 39 (1988) p. 76-91. The thesis of the authorship of Athanasius is completely convincing, especially the section on the doctrine of Arius is very familiar to every reader of the Arian discourses. As the title of the treatise shows, Stead does not change the chronological placement of the letter, but rather the common view of the beginning of Athanasius' theological literary activity. We read at the end: "We all know that there is a strong case for dating the *contra gentes* and the *De incarnatione* to the 330s; but I think I have shown that Athanasius was charged with an important task by his diocesan at the age of little more than 20 years, and fulfilled it with distinction. In this light it is clearly possible that he should have written the works I have mentioned a year or two earlier. The case is not closed; but any doubts on the score of youth and inexperience must be banished for ever". In my opinion, the con-

nic favorite adjective for the togetherness of Son and Father, ἴδιος, in the expressions ἰδίᾳ σοφία, ἴδιος λόγος. This means that III 26 has also preserved a piece of the contemporary theological debate for us and should be appreciated accordingly.

Kannengiesser believes that it is the Arians who bring the Christological problem into the debate with their arguments (see his outline). This [409] is not correct - they remain within the Trinitarian problem concerning the relationship of the Son to the Father. They bring forward statements of dependence and lowliness about Christ which do not allow, as they find, that the Son is by nature the Father (c. 26 beginning), and finally lead to the conclusion that the Son is creature and "one of those who have become" (conclusion). It is Athanasius who immediately transfers the problem to the Christological level at the beginning of chapter 27. The "solution principle" is indeed the Christological one, but it is not, as Kannengiesser writes, "the unity of the attributive subject in Christ", but the accent is on the distinction between the human and divine works of the incarnate Logos.

In the introduction to c. 26, Athanasius claims that the Arians, like Paul of Samosata, see only "the human" in Christ; in doing so, he takes up the insinuation already made by Alexander of Alexandria. In the following, I quote the main part of the chapter verbatim, arranging the text according to the aria-

sequences for the dating are quite different and concern the letter itself. 1. ὁμοίος κατ' οὐσίαν cannot have been formulated before the Nicene ὁμοούσιος. 2. although the letter condemns the teaching of Arius, the great villain and agitator is Euseb of Nicomedia (whereas in document 14, the letter of Alexander Ἠφίλαρχος, which is generally regarded as later, it is Arius himself). There is talk of the "old evil disposition" (Opitz p. 7,11) of Euseb - how *old* should this disposition be if the letter was written between 318 and 320? Euseb's move from Berytos to Nicomedia is mentioned in disparaging words and verbs of the past. - Urk. 4 b is preserved to us by Socrates' Ecclesiastical History (16), whereas Urk. 14 is indebted to Theodoret's Ecclesiastical History (14). Bardy, Lucien, has evaluated Socrates 16 for his section on Euseb of Nicomedia and, of course, has not overlooked the priceless notice at the end of 16 (one wishes there were more such notes in contemporary writings) that Alexander and Arius compiled dossiers from the letters favorable to them and that the various sects made use of these collections for their own purposes up to the time of Socrates. - Someone who certainly made use of Alexander's collection was Alexander's successor; should he not have enriched it in the end with an Alexander letter about Euseb at a time (since 328, the return of Euseb of Nicomedia from exile in the west) when the Bishop of Nicomedia was his very successful main opponent? In this later period, one could rightly speak of Euseb's *old* ill-will, which had shown itself when he stood up for Arius after the outbreak of the disputes. Furthermore, could Athanasius' Letter to Alexander not have had the function of replacing or displacing Alexander's genuine letter (Urk. 14), since the theology of the letter was not particularly useful in defending against the three-hypostasis trinity of the Eusebian central party (Father and Son as πράγματα, ὑποστάσεις, φύσεις)? Fortunately, Alexander's letter has been preserved. If both church historians had known both letters, it would have been interesting to learn the reasons for their choice - but that is, of course, a vain pipe dream.

I will organize the text according to key words, cite the biblical passages used and highlight Athanasius's comments:

... they say cheekily:

(a) (son) Mt. 28,18 John 5:22 Joh. 5,35 f. Lc. 10,22 John 6:37	How can the Son be like the Father by nature and in essence, who says: "All authority has been given to me", and: "The Father judges no one, but has given all judgment to the Son", and: "The Father loves the Son and has given all things into his hand. Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life", and again: "Everything has been given to me by my Father; and no one knows the Father except the Son and to whom the Son wills to reveal it", and again: "Everything that the Father has given me will come to me".
---	--

Then add them:

If, as you say, he was a son by nature, he had no need to conceive, but had (sc. all this) as a son by nature.

(b) (Power) Joh. 12,27 f. Mt 26:39 John 13:21	How can there be by nature and ³⁷ true power of the Father who says at the hour of his suffering: "Now my soul is afflicted; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour; but that is why I have come to this hour. Father, glorify your name. Then came a voice from heaven: "I have glorified you and will glorify you again". And again he said the same thing: "Father, if possible, may this cup pass away" and: "Saying this, Jesus was grieved in spirit and testified, saying, 'Amen, amen, I say to you, one of you will betray me.
---	--

And after these things the evil-minded say:

If he had been strong, he wouldn't have said anything, but would have given others the ability.

Then they say:

(c) (wisdom) Lc. 2,52 Mt 16:13 John 11:34 Mc. 6.38	If he was by nature true and proper wisdom of the Father, why is it written, "And Jesus went on in wisdom and age and favor with God and man" and, "Coming into the region of Caesarea Philippi, he asked the disciples who men said he was"; coming to Bethany, he asked where Lazarus lay; he then said to the disciples, "How many loaves have you?" How then, <i>they say</i> , is this wisdom, who goes on in wisdom and does not know what he wishes to learn from others?
--	--

³⁷ I have deliberately kept the Greek construction literal so that you can see that there are two terms: "power of the Father by nature" and "true power of the Father".

But this is also said of them:

(d) (Logos) Mt 27:46 John 12:28 John 17:5 Mt 26:41 Mt 13:32	How can he be the Father's own Word, without whom the Father never was, through whom he creates all things, as you think, who on the cross said, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" but before that he prayed, "Glorify your name," and, "Glorify me, Father, with the glory that I had with you before the world was"? And he prayed in solitude, exhorting the disciples to pray, lest they fall into temptation; and, "The spirit is willing," he said, "but the flesh is weak;" and: "About (that) day and hour no one knows (anything), neither the angels nor the Son".
--	---

Then the unworthy add this again:

If, according to your opinion, the Son existed eternally with God, he would not be ignorant of the day, but would know (about it) as Logos, would not have been abandoned by the Co-existent One, would not have asked to receive glory, who has it in the Father, he would not have prayed at all; for being Logos he would have needed nothing; but since he is a creature and one of those who have become, he therefore said such things and needed what he did not have. For it is peculiar to creatures [411] to have and to ask for what they do not have.

The shift from the Trinitarian to the Christological level in the evaluation of the words of Jesus presented by the Arians has the consequence that Athanasius does not adhere to the given structure, but proceeds as Kannengiesser schematically presents it (p. III):

Le Christ a "reçu" (nos. 36-41); il a "ignoré" (nos. 42-50);
il a "grandi" (nos. 51-53); il a été "troublé" (nos. 54-58).

III 26 is a continuation of the debate that had its starting point in the Arian distinction between an actual and an inauthentic Logos (wisdom, power) (the Son is the inauthentic Logos etc.). In Ctr. Ar. I/II Athanasius had substantiated this view with quotations from Asterius. In II 37 Athanasius counters the distinction with the (one!) "Logos of nature and³⁸ own" (analogous for the other titles). The Arian argumentation in III 26 attempts to prove Athanasius' view to be biblically untenable with the words of Christ himself, which are presented in a long chain. Of the distinction between two logoi (etc.) is now

38 See the previous note.

is no longer even mentioned. We can therefore conclude that the Arians responded to the first two speeches of Athanasius directed against them and attempted to refute the theological propositions of the Bishop of Alexandria. We also find ourselves in the contemporary discussion with the middle section of the third speech. In order to understand the inner context of this discussion in the succession of Asterius, Ctr. Ar.

I/II, Arians in III 26 and Athanasius in III 26-58, I present here II 37 in translation, whereby I replace the Asterius text with

Indent mark:

(*Athanasius*) Therefore I marvel how these, while God is one, introduce many images, wisdoms and logos according to their own concepts, and say that another is indeed the Father's own and by nature Logos³⁹ in whom he also made the Son, but that the true *Son* (being) is called only κατ' ἐπίνοιαν Logos, as (he is also called) Vine, Way, Door and Tree of Life. And he is called *Wisdom* according to his name, they say, for another is the Father's own and true Wisdom, which is unbegotten together with him, in which he also called the Son, creating him, Wisdom according to his participation in it. This did not come to them merely as words, but Arius put it together in his Thalia, and the sophist Asterius wrote thus, as we said earlier (sc. I 32):

The blessed Paul does not say that he proclaims Christ, *the* power of God or *the* wisdom of God, but without adding the article: the power of God and the wisdom of God (cf. 1 Cor. 1:24); proclaiming that his own *power* is a different one, the power that is inherent in him and exists with him without being begotten, that it has clearly begotten Christ, but has created the whole world, of which he also says in his letter to the Romans, teaching: "His invisible things have been seen since the creation of the world as known by the creatures, his ⁴⁰ eternal power and Godhead" (Rom. 1:20). Just as one could not say that the deity mentioned here is Christ, but is the Father himself, so I believe that his eternal power and deity is not the only-begotten Son, but the Father who begot (him). Another power and wisdom of God, he teaches, is that shown through Christ.

And after a few things the same *Asterius* says:

Although the, his,⁴⁰ eternal power and wisdom, which the considerations (nominative!) of truth prove to be beginningless and unbegotten, do indeed appear as one and the same,⁴¹ (so) however, many (femin.) are those created (sc. wisdoms and powers) by him, whose first-born and only-begotten is Christ; all (fem.) are certainly equally dependent on their owner; and all are rightly called powers of him who created them and

³⁹ I emphasize the four key words that determine the structure (albeit not in the same order) of III 26.

⁴⁰ "Die, seine,..." is an attempt to retain ἡ ... αὐτοῦ in the translation as well, since it is not relevant for the Asterius' argumentation depends on the article.

⁴¹ Kannengiesser (p. 153) translates the end of this sentence misleadingly: "Cependant son éternelle Puissance et Sagesse, que les arguments de la vérité démontrent comme sans commencement ni génération, serait sans doute, elle aussi, l'une (des puissances)".

For example, the prophet says (cf. Joel 2:25) that the locust, which has become a God-sent punishment of human sins, is not only called "power", but also "great" by God himself; but the blessed David exhorts in several Psalms not only angels,⁴² but also powers,⁴³ to praise God.⁴³

[413] In the third Arian discourse, no quotation from Asterius appears in the anti-Arian middle section, but there is one in each of the anti-Eusebian sections, which is why the two quotations also have different theological aspects than those used in I/II - they had to fit into the changed discussion situation. Their polemical purpose is to equate the Eusebians with the Arians, i.e. they support what Athanasius is not afraid to say, even in dry words. In the art of polemics, Athanasius is known to be as skilled as his contemporaries.⁴⁴ It can hardly be doubted that his polemics in the third speech also served ecclesiastical political purposes in the run-up to the Synod of Serdica. It should be made clear that the Bishop of Alexandria was a personality of complex character: both the scriptural theologian, to whom Martin Tetz repeatedly refers with reverence, and the church politician, as Eduard Schwartz loved to portray him. Anyone who considers only one of these manifestations to be the whole man, is registering him.

⁴² BKV adds the article to both nouns, but it is intentionally left out.

⁴³ The two Asterius quotations are found in their longest form in Athanasius, *De synodis* 18 (in *Bardy's* count no. I and II a). Of the Asterius quotations in *Ctr. Ar. I/II*, *Kannengiesser's* numbers I (Kanneng. p. 35) and IV (p. 152) are short and partly free excerpts from the text quoted above. Kannengiesser rightly speaks of the preponderance of his quotation VII in *Ctr. Ar. I/II* (p. 174-181). - A brief summary of the theology of the sophist Asterius according to the fragments can be found in Kinzig, *In search of Asterius*, p. 125-132.

⁴⁴ One can only emphasize what Stead says about this (JThSt 1985, p. 226): "I have argued that Athanasius' superb theological imagination does not excuse his controversial methods; does not prevent him from resorting on occasion to arguments that are downright dishonest and unsound. He is following a fashion in polemics of which modern Christians may well feel ashamed; indeed he has worked to extend and impose that tradition. I also think that sometimes, although the answer he presents to a problem as he conceives it is wholly convincing, the problem itself is misconceived."

5.2 What does the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum (C) to do with the Council of Constantinople in 381?

For Fr. Alois Grillmeier S. J.

1 The theological tomos from 381

Before we deal with the problem of our topic, let us begin with a text *that* is certain to have something to do with the Council of Constantinople, namely the summary of the theological teaching of the Council, which the Synod of the following year, held in the same place, communicated in a letter. Theodoret preserved this synodal letter of 382 addressed to the West in his Church History, and I quote the summary from it in my outline¹:

(The Nicene faith teaches us)

- A I α πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος
- b δηλαδὴ θεότητος καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος πιστευομένης,
- c ὁμοτιμοῦ τε τῆς ἀξίας καὶ συναϊδίου τῆς βασιλείας
- II α ἐν τρισὶ τελειοτάτοις ὑποστάσεσιν, ἡγουν
τρισὶ τελειοτάταις προσώποις,
- b1 ὥς μήτε τὴν Σαβελλίου νόσον χώραν λαβεῖν
συγχεομένων τῶν ὑποστάσεων
εἴτ' οὖν τῶν ιδιοτήτων ἀναιρουμένων,
- b2α μήτε μὴν τὴν Εὐνομιανῶν καὶ Ἀρειανῶν
καὶ πνευματομάχων βλασφημίαν ἰσχύειν,
τῆς οὐσίας ἢ τῆς φύσεως [ἡ]² τῆς θεότητος τεμονομένης
- b2β καὶ τῇ ἀκτίστῳ καὶ ὁμοουσίῳ καὶ συναϊδίῳ τριάδι
μεταγενεστέρας τινὸς ἢ κτιστῆς ἢ ἑτερουσίου φύσεως ἐπαγομένης.

Note: The core of this essay (sections 2-9) was presented in English at the XI International Patristic Congress in August 1991, in revised form and with section 1 added in German in December 1992 in Tübingen; the text has been revised again for printing, and appendices A and B as well as notes have been added. I would like to thank my assistant Dr. Chr. Marksches for the fair copy on PC.

¹ Theodoret, h.e. (ed. *Parmentier/Scheidweiler*, GCS 44) V 9, 11 ff, 292,12-293,3.

² Deleted by me as superfluous and disruptive.

- B a καὶ τὸν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως δὲ τοῦ κυρίου
 λόγον ἀδιάστροφον σώζομεν,
 [482] οὔτε ἄψυχον οὔτε ἄνουν ἢ ἀτελῆ
 τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς οἰκονομίαν παραδεχόμενοι,
 b ὅλον δὲ εἰδότες τέλειον μὲν πρὸ αἰώνων ὄντα θεὸν λόγον,
 τέλειον δὲ ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν
 σωτηρίαν γενόμενον.

This abridged version should long ago have been included in the collections of sources with council decisions, analogous to the Chalcedonense. Translated, the document reads:

(The Nicene faith teaches us)

- A I a to believe in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit
 b by clearly believing (δηλαδή) in the deity and power and being of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit
 c equally honored in dignity and eternal in dominion
 II a in three completely perfect hypostases, i.e.
 three perfect persons,
 b1 so that neither the evil of Sabellius has place
 where the hypostases are heaped together nor
 the peculiarities are abolished,
 b2α nor even the blasphemy of the Eunomians and Arians
 and Pneumatomachen have power,
 where the essence or nature³ of the deity is cut
 b2ββ and the uncreated and co-essential and co-eternal Trinity
 any younger or created or non-equivalent nature is added.
 B a And we keep the doctrine of the incarnation of
 the Lord untwisted
 by understanding the salvation of the flesh and the soul or without νοῦς
 or incompletely
 b but in that we know without restriction (ὅλον) the perfect God Logos
 who existed before the eons,
 the one who became fully human at the end of days for the sake of our
 salvation.

At first glance, one recognizes that there are two topics, the doctrine of the Trinity and Christology (A and B). The Christological part is directed against Apollinarius,

³ See the previous note on the Greek text. [L. A. has deleted the equivalent of the German word "oder" after the word for "nature" in the Greek text - *ed.*]

first in defense of the false (a), then in establishing the true (b). It is wrong to imagine the "salvific event in the [483] flesh", i.e. the incarnation, as if the human nature of Christ had no soul or no *voũς* - in Apollinarius the Logos takes its place, but this is not specifically stated here.

In the following we will deal with the statements about the Trinity (A); they are packed into one long sentence structure, using extensive absolute genitives.

Section I speaks of the unity of the Trinity, section II of the Trinity. The unity is to be found in the divinity, power and essence of Father, Son and Spirit (b). Line (c) could seem like a mere embellishment, but it is not. For something happens here in this line that we also find in the roughly contemporaneous Tomus Damasi, a Western document: predication that are usually used for one of the three persons of the Trinity are assigned to the predicates for their unity. Homotimy was a term that Basil of Caesarea liked to use for the co-divinity *of the Spirit* - as is well known, this Cappadocian could not decide on the statement of the homoousia of the Spirit. And in the case of the equality of kingship, we come across a keyword from the Eusebians' disputes with the peculiar doctrine of the Trinity of Markell of Ancyra⁴ together with the associated interpretation of 1 Cor 15. This debate concerned *the Son* in his relationship to the Father.

The one deity is believed "in three hypostases" (II). This explicitly states the basic Nicene formula, one ousia, three hypostases, which does not appear as such in C. The superlative form *τελειοτάταις* (a) is perhaps to be understood as trumping the "perfect" persons of the next line. De Halleux has found⁵ that the Old Nicene party could understand itself to be "three *perfect* persons" as the outermost statement for the trinity in the unity, but in no case to three hypostases. "Three persons" alone had already been rejected by Basil as insufficient; three hypostases would also have to be predicated. It is interesting enough that the Nicene Meletians included the Old Nicene formula in their text, but of course in their own interpretation.

In the long section IIb, false doctrines of the Trinity are rejected. Incidentally, one notices a chiasmic structure of the entire text: A

⁴ The Tübingen dissertation by K. Seibt, *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra*, is now fundamental on the teachings of Markell of Ankyra and overtakes earlier interpretations. It will be published in the "Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte" (Berlin) [Volume 59, published 1994, reprint 2014 - d. Editor].

⁵ A. de Halleux, "Hypostase" et "personne" dans la formation du dogme trinitaire (ca. 375-381), in: RHE 79 (1984) 313-369.625-670. Now in: A. de Halleux, *Patrologie et Œcuménisme*. Recueil d'études (BETHL 93), Leuven 1990, no. 5, 113-214, where the original page numbers are given; I include both. About the phenomenon mentioned in the text: 329/129 with notes.

begins with the true doctrine of the Trinity and [484] then rejects the variants of the false; B, on the other hand, places the true doctrine of Christ at the end. This is no doubt a deliberate arrangement.

II b 1 is directed against "Sabellius" - this can stand for the monarchian identification of Father and Son, but also for the doctrine of the one divine hypostasis as represented by Markell of Ankyra; it is more likely that the latter is being fought against here. In any case, this refers to any doctrine of the Trinity that *does not* distinguish between the three divine hypostases. Such a doctrine would "lump together" the hypostases and abolish their peculiarities. It is the topicality of ἀσύγχυτος ἔνωσις that is applied here to the Trinity (the preservation of peculiarity, ιδιότης, is part of this)⁶: The interpretation of the opposing view as a rejection of ἀσύγχυτος ἔνωσις means, of course, that the Synod itself teaches precisely this "unmixed unity" of the Trinity - also a legacy of Basil.

The doctrine of the Eunomians, Arians and Pneumatomachians, who assumed various degrees of subordination and dissimilarity, whether between the Son and the Father or between the Spirit and the other two persons of the Trinity, is treated as a counterpart to the false idea of unity (b 2): they cut up the ousia or nature of the Godhead - I have deleted the second = ἢ "or" (α). And thus (β) they add to the Trinity something that is later or created, at any rate of a different ousia than that of the one divine, coessential, coeternal Trinity. It should be noted that the famous Nicene ὁμοούσιος, which there concerns the relationship between Father and Son, appears here as a predicate for the whole Trinity. This repeats the process that we have already observed in I c: the predicate for a specific Trinitarian person is transferred from this person to the whole Trinity.

In the letter of 382, this theological declaration is preceded by an appeal to Nicaea, and the declaration itself now concludes with the inclusion of a Nicene expression in Bb: having become man "for the sake of our salvation". The following paragraph of the letter reports that the heresies were condemned in writing in Constantinople in 381 - the old Nicaenum (N), as is well known, concluded with anathematisms. We now come to the text that is traditionally regarded as the decisive product of the Synod of 381 and whose relationship to this Synod is so difficult to determine.

is to C.

⁶ On this topos see my study Συνάφεια and ἀσύγχυτος ἔνωσις as a term for trinitarian and christological unity, in: L. Abramowski, *Drei christologische Untersuchungen* (BZNW 45), Berlin 1981, 63-109.

2 A.-M. Ritter on the development of C

In his 1965 monograph on the Council of Constantinople and [485] its symbol, Ritter⁷ proposed a solution to the problem that has since become a generally accepted opinion⁸. According to Ritter, the confession of faith "of the 150 Fathers", as it was apparently first called in Chalcedon 451, was a formula with which the Macedonians were to be incorporated into the Nicene orthodoxy; this plan failed. Ritter himself concedes⁹ that the symbol played no further role during the synod in Constantinople. Nevertheless, viewed as a product of that council, C is the premise on which Ritter's entire book is based.

Recently, in an essay in the *Vigiliae Christianae*¹⁰, R. Staats once again attention to the correspondences between C and the Romanum in the second article of the Confession¹¹. These are the phrases ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου in the incarnation statement and ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου in the crucifixion of *Jesus*. Staats would like to assume that C was formulated by the Meletians at their synod of 379 in Antioch¹²; this synod was still friendly towards Rome¹³, in contrast to Constantinople in 381, where a hostile mood towards the West prevailed. Since the tomos of the Antiochian synod was recognized in the assemblies of 381 and 382, it can be assumed that documents of the Antiochian synod were contained in the acts of the Constantinopolitan synods and could thus later be attributed to the assembly of 381. This is an important point at which my argumentation will coincide with that of Staats.

But I cannot agree with Staats when he says that the "broader (πλατύτερον) faith" of Tomus of Antioch, which is spoken of in 382, is C¹⁴. For πλατύτερον, "broader", it is called in comparison to the theological summary immediately before in the letter¹⁵; this summary is described as such: ἐν κεφαλαίῳ¹⁶. The summary and C do not differ in length in such a way that C could be the "broader" text. It is clear that the state is characterized by the

⁷ A. M. Ritter, *The Council of Constantinople and its Symbol*. Göttingen 1965.

⁸ See e.g. *de Halleux*, l.c. 658/202 n. 3.

⁹ *Knight* 197.

¹⁰ R. Staats, *The Roman Tradition in the Symbol of 381 (NC) and its Emergence at the Synod of Antioch 379*, in: *VigChr* 44 (1990), 209-221.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 211.

¹² *De Halleux* dated this synod l.c. 640/184 to 380; but he does not hold to the new date. (letter dated December 2, 1991).

¹³ *State* 213 f.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 216.

¹⁵ *Theodore* 292 f.

¹⁶ *Theodore* 293.15.

formulation¹⁷, "we have confessed the faith", has been misled into "broader" text with C [486]. But πίστις is nothing other than the material that is now summarized ἐν κεφαλαίῳ.

Although every piece of news about the Synod of 381 and its antecedents has been passed back and forth countless times, there is one piece of evidence about the origin of C that has not yet received the attention it deserves. It is the first section (in Tonneau's counting) of the 9th Catechetical Homily of Theodore of Mopsuestia.¹⁸ Homily 9 is the first of the two discourses on the Holy Spirit and the remaining statements of the third article of faith. In this context it is useful to bear in mind that Theodore belongs to the Meletian party, that he is a contemporary of the events and that he was still a presbyter in Antioch at the time of the synods. Everything he has to report is therefore of great weight. Ritter has, of course, taken into account the text¹⁹ from which we learn that a *western* synod supplemented the article on the Holy Spirit in the Nicaenum; that the western synod sent the Nicaenum thus supplemented to the East, where a synod there signed it. The eastern synod is correctly identified by Ritter as the great Meletian synod. However, Ritter does not believe his own eyes; by using the rule,

"What cannot be, that must not be", he says: "Now only the Synod of 381, but not the Synods of Antioch and Rome, which also come into question, testify to an extension of the symbol". However, since Ritter had set out to examine the traditional attribution of C to the Council of 381, it is of course a methodological error to make this tradition the criterion for his own examination.

In a later section of the 9th homily, namely the 14th, Theodore himself speaks of the "ecumenical" synod; he calls its participants the "teachers of the Church". The catechist also names the dogmatic theme of the assembly, and Ritter relates this to C. Accordingly, Ritter concludes: "Consequently, in" Theodore's "homilies we should have unambiguous evidence that the Synod of 381 supplemented the Nicene faith with regard to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit." ²⁰ I note that Ritter's "we should" still retains a trace of uncertainty, despite the adjective "unambiguous". Ritter's treatment of the

9 Theodore's homily, however, has the merit of describing the events of which the

¹⁷ Theodoret 293.9.

¹⁸ R. Tonneau / R. Devreesse (ed.), *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste* (StT 145), Città del Vaticano 1949 - The significance of the passage mentioned came to me during the preparation of a conference in the fall of 1989, when I was to speak on the Filioque and, despairing of being able to say anything new on this subject, turned to the problem of the origin of C, among other things, and read Theodore as a contemporary.

¹⁹ Knight 154.

²⁰ Knight 155.

sections 1 and 14, while others have referred them to the same synod.

The origin of the supplemented Nicaenum in Rome would explain in the most natural way the presence of the typical Roman clauses on the incarnation and death of Christ in C. But shouldn't one also be able to find a trace of this on the Roman side? I will come back to this below. First, let's take a closer look at Theodore's ten homilies on faith, especially the last two on the Holy Spirit.

3 Theodore as a nineteenth-century theologian after his catecheses

Since the 16 catecheses became known in full in 1932/3 through Mingana's edition of the Syriac translation²¹, they have been analyzed by symbol research. A. Rücker²² and J. Lebon²³ excerpted the credo explained by the catechist and produced a retroversion into Greek. The so-called "Nestorianum"²⁴ reconstructed by Caspari and retranslated into Greek was obviously used as an aid for the retranslation. This is why Lebon (reprinted in Denzinger-Schönmetzer) reads "wir glauben" instead of "ich glaube"²⁵. In the literature, Theodore is cited above all as an important witness to the phenomenon that a credo, which bears so much more resemblance to C than to the pure Nicaenum, is nevertheless considered to be of is considered to come from "our blessed fathers". The "blessed fathers" are those of Nicaea, as Theodore expressly states in Homily 3 § 12.

It is striking how *often* Theodore mentions the "blessed fathers" in the ten days during which he explains the Christian faith to the candidates for baptism. I have counted about 55 cases where the "blessed" (or "holy") "fathers" or simply the "fathers" are mentioned: this does not include the cases where they appear merely under the 3rd person pronoun of the plural. The Syriac text of the discourses on faith is written on 140 pages - this gives an idea of the frequency with which they appear.

²¹ A. Mingana (ed.), *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed* (WoodSt V), Cambridge 1932; *Commentary ... on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist* (ibid. VI), Cambridge 1933.

²² A. Rücker, *Ritus baptismi et missae, quem descripsit Theodorus ep. Mopsuestenus* (OTHE. I 2), Münster 1933, 43 f.

²³ J. Lebon, *Les anciens symboles dans la définition de Chalcédoine*, in: RHE 32 (1936), 809-876; here 836.

²⁴ Reprinted in A. and L. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln*, Breslau ¹⁸⁹⁷³ as § On the "Nestorianum", its sources and the new questions raised by Theodorus' symbol, see G. L. Dossetti, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli*, Rome etc. 1967, 279-281 n. 24. Dossetti rightly says 281: "Credo che la questione meriti un'indagine più approfondita." See also below at the end of Appendix B, 512 [here in this volume p. 360 - *the editor*].

²⁵ For Rücker's and Lebon's versions and the necessary corrections to them, see Appendix B below.

the mention. Of course, the "Fathers" usually appear in [488] the introduction of quotations from the Confession, but the catechist could also have introduced them with "our faith says" or the like. He certainly did not choose his citation formulas without reason.

There is no consensus on the date of the baptismal speeches. Did Theodore deliver them before 392, when he was still presbyter in Antioch, or only afterwards, as bishop of Mopsuestia? Tonneau argues for the earlier date²⁶. In any case, the terminus a quo is firmly established by Homily 9 § 14 on the "ecumenical synod" and its teaching on the Holy Spirit. The long-standing Antiochian schism continued after 381, after the death of Bishop Meletius during the Council of Constantinople. The Meletian bishop was now Flavian; in addition, the ancient Nicene community continued to exist under Paulinus (and Euagrius after him). In this situation it is easy to understand why the presbyter of the Nicene community, Theodore, constantly affirmed that *his* church stood firmly in the Nicene faith. If we consider the strong emphasis on the Nicene origin of the Confession in this light, it becomes an indication of the place where the speeches were delivered: it is more likely to be Antioch²⁷ than Mopsuestia, so they would have been written between 381 and 392.

Despite the emphasis on the Nicene, it is very much the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity in which Theodore instructs the baptized. Homily 2 and the beginning of Homily 3 interpret the baptismal command of Mt 28 with the doctrine of the three hypostases of the one divine nature. It is Christ himself who, in his last words, handed down to us the doctrine of the three Trinitarian hypostases. Each of them is truly God, the divine nature is in the three, to confess three hypostases does not mean to confess a polytheism (which the baptized had just left behind), these are the main points that the catechist wants to impress upon the hearers about the three divine persons. Mt 28 is also the starting point in the theological summary of 382²⁸ and therefore probably had the same function in the *tomoi* of 381 and 379. In Homily 2 § 5, Theodore explains that

"the doctrine of the three hypostases" was the "true profession of faith of Christians" "and the true knowledge of those who have been made disciples of Christ". The implications of such statements must have been clear to those who were aware of the existence of two Nicene-minded communities under two bishops in Antioch.

Under these circumstances, it is remarkable in two respects that Col 1:15 is quoted in Article IIa of the Theodorian Creed: [489] "the firstborn of all creation" (Homily 3 § 6). This is one of the differences between Theodore

²⁶ Tonneau XVI - Denzinger/Schönmetzer follow this, but give an inconsistent place: Mopsu(h)estia in Cilicia.

²⁷ The problem is finally solved by the implementation in Appendix A b) below.

²⁸ Theodoret 292, 12 f.

and C, because C does not have the words. In itself, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως was a predication of the Son valued by the Eusebians; we find it in the formula of the Synod of Antioch 341. Should a trace of the Homoean past of the Meletian party²⁹ have been preserved here in Theodore?

The traditional synonymy of πρωτότοκος and μονογενής as the title of the pre-existent Son had been fiercely opposed by Markell of Ankyra; Athanasius had followed him, as can be seen in *Contra Arianos* II 62. Both give the title πρωτότοκος, which in its biblical location clearly stands for the pre-existence of the Son, a new interpretation: in their opinion, πρωτότοκος belongs to the descent of the Son to the creatures. This is to avoid the subordinationist connotations of the title, as the opponents exploited them. Theodore - and this is the really surprising aspect in his interpretation of the quotation as part of the baptismal creed - follows Markell and Athanasius in their Christological (i.e. not Trinitarian) interpretation of the title. Does this express a rapprochement with the Old Nicene party? One must also ask what Theodore's source is: general knowledge of the existence of such an exegesis, or specific knowledge of an Athanasian or pseudo-Athanasian writing? In the context of Theodore's explanation of the Confession, the incarnational understanding of Col 1:15 serves his purpose of finding the unity of the two natures in the one person of Christ already expressed in Article IIa of the Symbol.

On this occasion another difference between Theodore's baptismal symbol and C should be mentioned, in this case the article II b; it is the antimarkellic line of C: οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. This line is missing in Theodor. I'm not sure what to conclude from this. Is C here clinging to the Eusebian tradition, while Theodore does not want to upset the Antiochian Old Nicenes? The Roman, i.e. Damasian, documents of the time, which are directed to the East and which we will discuss later, contain some anti-Markellian sentences³⁰. We have already seen how the theological summary of 382 deals with this topos: the category of βασιλεία is divided into the predicates of unity and unity.

²⁹ On the problem of Meletius' transition from Homœanism to Neo-Niceneism, see H. C. Brennecke, *Erwägungen zu den Anfängen des Neunizänismus*, in: *Oecumenica et Patristica* (FS W. Schneemelcher), Chambéry-Geneva 1989, 241-257.

³⁰ Schwartz (see below n. 32), no. 2, 20,1-21,4 unius usque ... tres tamen adseramus personas, *nec redire in se aut minui ... nec prolative verbum* ut generationem ei demamus. - Ibid. No. 4, 22,32-23,3 ita etiam plenitudinem dei verbi *non prolative sed nati neque in patre remanentis*, ut non sit, sed ex aeterno in aeternum subsistentis perfectum, id est integrum transgressorem adsumpsisse et salvasse confidimus. - The presentation and rejection of Markell's doctrine of the Logos as a (mere) προφορικός can already be found in the Formula makrostichos of the Eusebians. It can be assumed that Basil conveyed this presentation of Markellian doctrine to the West, cf. ep. 263 in the West, c. 5 (ed. Courtonne III, [490] 125,6-8): ... let the doctrine of Markell be: οὔτε υἱὸν ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει ὁμολογῶν, ἀλλὰ προενεχθέντα καὶ πάλιν ὑποστρέψαντα εἰς τὸν ὅθεν προήλθεν, οὔτε ... - Ep. 263 is first dated to 377, but the dating of Schwartz nos. 2-4 is uncertain, terminus ad quem 379.

equality of Father, Son and Spirit (*see also* I c) and thus removed from the realm of polemics.

4 Theodor on the Nicaenum and its completion in Article III

In the first paragraph of Homily 9, Theodore, according to his custom, takes up the theme of the previous speech: You have heard, he begins, what the blessed Fathers taught us about the Father and the οἰκονομία of the humanity of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ in accordance with the tradition of the sacred Scriptures. Then the catechist begins with a new topic: "Now let us cite what is written after what has been said; this is now the sentence about the Holy Spirit, which the blessed Fathers, who gathered from everywhere in the city of Nicaea in that wonderful synod, said simply and without (further) investigation: 'and to the Holy Spirit'". This is the first time that a sentence is quoted in the baptismal discourses as it appears in the pure Nicaenum. The reason given for the simple formulation of Nicaea in the matter of the Holy Spirit is the well-known and accurate one: "They thought that this was sufficient for the hearers of that time". The catechist continues: "*Those after them*, however, gave us a *complete* teaching on the Holy Spirit". We also hear how this took place: "*First* the western bishops assembled among themselves and held a synod, because they could not come to the East on account of the persecutions by the Arians who prevailed in that region; *and afterwards*, when divine grace caused the persecution to cease, the eastern bishops also received with joy the doctrine which had been transmitted by this western synod, and they agreed with their opinion and indicated communion with them by their own signatures."

In his introduction to Theodore's speeches, Tonneau³¹ has accompanied the quoted passage with a

This subscription is preserved in a summarized and isolated form at the end of a group of Roman, or more precisely Damasian, texts. These Latin texts are in the Codex Veronensis LX; E. Schwartz published them critically in 1936³², but Tonneau still refers to the older editions with their incorrect [491] readings. This small complex of documents also deserves a few comments in our context.

³¹ Tonneau XVI n. 2.

³² E. Schwartz, Über die Sammlung des Cod. Veronensis LX, in: ZNW 35 (1936) 1-23; the Latin Text 19-23.

5 The Epistles of Damasus and the subscription of the great Meletian Synod in Cod. Veron. LX

The collection consists of a complete synodal letter to the East and three excerpts "ex parte decreti". Scholars do not agree on the date of the various pieces and on the question of whether the excerpts come from *one* letter or from several. The one complete letter, usually counted as ep. 1 of Bishop Damasus, concerns the case of Bishop Auxentius of Milan. The subsequent excerpts are usually counted as ep. 2 of Damasus. In his edition, however, Schwartz has given the individual pieces consecutive numbers, 1-5, according to his custom; no. 5 is the eastern synodal subscription. In future, the numbering according to these numbers should be retained. No. 1, the letter "Confidimus quidem", has a regular lemma: "exemplum synodi habitae Romae episcoporum XCIII ex rescripto imperiali"; the letter also has a complete list of senders and recipients. It ends with the request to the recipients: "reci- procis sanctitatis vestrae litteris adprobate" = "Acknowledge (this) with a letter of reply from your Holiness". Should No. 5 then be the rest of the letter of assent that was requested with No. 1? Schwartz was of this opinion in 1936³³. But no. 1 also has a colophon: "Ego Sabinus diaconus Mediolanensis legatus de authentico dedi" = "I, the legate, the Milanese deacon Sabinus, have given this according to the original".

M. In 1949, Richard took this remark by Sabinus as the starting point for a essay³⁴, which can now also be read in the collected writings³⁵. The colophon states that Sabinus made a copy of the original letter entrusted to him. According to Richard, the copy was intended for Basil of Caesarea, and it was Athanasius who had arranged for it to be copied³⁶. But would the Synod of Antioch 379 have signed a copy that was not intended for them? It must have expected an original addressed to itself!

In addition to the formal argument against an original affiliation of No. 1 and No. 5, there is a substantive one. It is inconceivable that a contemporary assembly of Nicene Christians would have agreed with the Trinitarian statement of Letter No. 1, even if everything else in this letter had of course been accepted: the appeal to [492] the Niceneum and to the apostolic tradition and the criticism of the Synod of Rimini. With regard to the Trinity, it is required to believe that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are of one deitas, one virtus (= power or force), one figura and one substantia (Schwartz p. 19,24 f.). Of these vocabularies, three would have been acceptable (if one had not immediately understood substantia to mean ὑπόστασις): una deitas, una virtus, una substantia. But what

³³ Schwartz 14.

³⁴ M. Richard, Saint Basile et la mission du diacre Sabinus, in: AnBoll 67 (1949), 178-202.

³⁵ M. Richard, Opera Minora, T. II, Turnhout/Leuven 1977, no. 34.

³⁶ Richard 183 - Did Basil himself have a copy made for Antioch?

should only mean "figura"?³⁷ A figure, mode of appearance, person? In any of these meanings it would have been unacceptable to the representatives of the Nicene three-hypostasis theory. For the derivation of "figura", nothing else seems to come into question than Heb 1:3 "figura substantiae eius", the translation of χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. Was substantiae understood as an explicative genitive? At the biblical site, it is of course the *son* who is referred to as χαρακτήρ. In any case, one cannot envy the legate Sabinus on his mission if he had to explain to Basil of Caesarea the opinion of his Western clients.

Nos. 2-4 in the collection do not show any protocol, with the exception of the already mentioned lemma, which is repeated in every case, "item ex parte decreti", and an "explicit" at the end of no. 4.

No. 5 itself is a complex of protocol and quotation. First we have a lemma which says: "This epistle or expositio of the Roman Synod, held under Damasus", was sent to the East, where the whole Eastern Church held a Synod at Antioch; they believed in agreement (with the West), all agreed to the faith set forth above, and each confirmed it by his signature. (Compare above, section 4, the quotations from Theodore!). Then follows the beginning of the list of signatures in full. The first signature is that of Meletius episcopus, five names follow in Schwartz's edition (he has deleted one in between), the fifth name is that of the Bishop of Tarsus, Diodorus. The rest is summarized: "Similiter et alii CXLVI orientales episcopi subscripse- runt" - that makes a total of 151 bishops. The signatures are then appended: "quorum subscriptiones in authenticum hodie in archivis Romanae ecclesiae tenentur"³⁸. Finally, the colophon of the entire collection follows: "explicit synodus Romana et Antiochensis".

Whose "decretum" is it from which the excerpts no. 2-4 "item", "likewise" were taken? Schwartz took it to be the decree of the great Mele[493]tian Synod³⁹, which would have contained the documents sent from Rome in the preceding years. We have seen that he considered subscription no. 5 to be the answer to no. 1. When the whole complex was compiled in the early 5th century, the excerpts in between would have been taken from the sources in the Antiochian archive and inserted in their present place⁴⁰. Who wrote the comments that now frame the signatures of the Eastern Synod? Are they in the

³⁷ Richard does not deal with this problem.

³⁸ Of course, this is said from the interested side - the Antiochian side. But if According to what is explained below in section 6, could the letter actually be found in the Roman archives?

³⁹ Schwartz 14.

⁴⁰ Schwartz 16.

were they written at the time of compilation? De Halleux is also of the opinion that the excerpts come from the Meletian dossier⁴¹. The Sabinus copy (no. 1) must also have been in it.

So although No. 1 and No. 5 could not originally belong together, the collector's interest in their combination is easy to recognize. Oriental approval of the Western judgment of Auxentius could benefit the Antiochene efforts to dispel any remaining suspicion of "Arianism" on the part of the Meletians. The problematic Trinitarian formulation of No. 1 could be considered balanced for the collector by No. 2, because it speaks of a *usia* (Schwarz p. 20,24; 21,16 f.) and *tres personae*; "a *usia*" of course goes back to Eastern intervention, thus excluding any misunderstanding that could have arisen from the vocabulary *substantia*. One would give much to possess the letter of the great Meletian synod to which the preserved list of signatures originally belonged, and even more so the Roman letter to which he replied!

After the disappointment of all that the collection from Cod. Veron. LX *does not* say about that synod, Theodore's remarks from Homily 9 § 1 *gain* further weight. And they finally allow us to recognize the value of a remark which belongs to the introduction of the Tomus Damasi and which has not yet been considered in this context.

[494] 6 A Roman note on the completion of the article on the Holy Spirit in the Nicaenum

In Turner's edition of the Tomus Damasi in the Monumenta (I 2,1)⁴², the Tomus is preceded by an introduction: "(Here) begins the faith, written in Nicaea by the 318 (quite) faithful bishops"⁴³, which is followed by the Nicaenum in Latin⁴⁴. On the next page⁴⁵ Turner begins with the parallel printing of the Latin original of the Tomus and the Greek translation from Theodoret's Ecclesiastical History. Theodoret offers an interesting lemma from which it emerges that the recipient Paulinus (of Antioch, it is assumed) was in Thessalonica in Macedonia. Some Latin manuscripts have a comparable lemma, but shorter and without a location. But a large group of manuscripts say - and it must be made clear that the remark refers directly to the last of the Nicene

⁴¹ De Halleux, "Hypostase" et "personne", 365/165 n. 3 and 636/180 with n. 1-4.

⁴² C. H. Turner, [Tomus Damasi,] EOMIA [i.e. Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima - the editor] I 2,1 (1913), 283 ff.

⁴³ Ibid. 283a.

⁴⁴ Ibid. 283a.b.

⁴⁵ Ibid. 284.

nische Anathemata - "Post hoc, concilium quod in urbe Roma congregatum est a catholicis episcopis addiderunt de spiritu sancto" = "Afterwards, the council assembled in the city of Rome by the Catholic bishops added about the Holy Spirit". This corresponds entirely to what is written in the first half of the quotation from Theodore (see section 4 above) and therefore also refers to the same Roman synod mentioned in no. 5 of the collection from Cod. Veron. LX was mentioned. One would now expect that in the introduction to the Tomus Damasi this remark would be followed by the expanded Nicaenum or at least the completed 3rd article⁴⁶. Instead, the Tomus of the Roman bishop⁴⁷ now follows immediately.

Turner has enclosed the note in square brackets, indicating deletion. Like Ritter with regard to Theodore's report, Turner obviously could not believe his eyes here, but one must bear in mind that he could not yet have been familiar with Theodore's complete baptismal catecheses. Regarding the manuscripts that omit the note, Turner remarks: "Probably correct, nor do they seem to be the words of the Council itself". As always, the great English scholar has collected an immense amount of material on the printed text, and from this it emerges that the note was known to a collection of canons of the first half of the [495] 5th century and that Pope Vigilius in his Constitutum of 554 (it is the so-called Constitu- tum II) knew the Tomus Damasi with this preceding note⁴⁸. The first witness is older than all the Hss. that Turner used for the Tomus Damasi (most of them date from the Carolingian period), the second is as old as the oldest ms. of the Tomus. The note must therefore remain in the text and the square brackets must be deleted. So here we have the trace of the steps that led to the formation of C that I missed on the Roman side.

The only explanation I can think of for the displacement of the Roman extended Nicaenum by the Tomus Damasi is this: The *κοινωνία* between the Meletian Synod of Antioch and Rome, which had been established by the acceptance of the Roman letter with the supplemented Nicaenum, attested by the subscription, was established by a Roman decision in a different direction

⁴⁶ But the note has caused the scribes of some Hss. to extend the III. article of the preceding pure N, namely by the colon *neque facturam neque creaturam sed de substantia deitatis*, *Turner* 283b, 18-20; these expressions have been taken over from the II. article.

⁴⁷ The connection is facilitated by the fact that the Tomus Damasi refers back to the Nicaenum and begins with statements about the Holy Spirit. But the Tomus as a whole is not only concerned with the doctrine of the Spirit.

⁴⁸ *Turner* 284a, n. to lines 28-31 and 296 n. 3 and n. 6. The reference given in n. 6, "c. XXVI" comes from the numbering of the sections in the older editions of the Acts, according to which *Turner* quotes the passage. The so-called Constitutum II has since been published in ACO IV 2 (1914) (138-168). Schwartz gave the untitled manuscript, which also lacks a beginning, the title. *Ex Vigili papae epistula de tribus capitulis*, and has marked this title with angle brackets as an addition. *Turner's* quotation p. 167, 2-9 (in § 161), minimal differences in spelling. Schwartz makes a reference to *Turner* in the margin.

abolished again. Paulinus, the ancient Nicene bishop of Antioch, went to Rome after Flavian had been consecrated as the successor of Meletius after the Synod of 381; and in Rome Paulinus was again recognized as the legitimate bishop of Antioch. Perhaps he insisted on the sufficiency of the pure Nicaenum, whereby he could have referred to Athanasius' *Tomus ad Antiochenos*⁴⁹ - no matter what he and the Romans actually had to say about the Holy Spirit. Of course, the Romans could not simultaneously hold to the *κοινωνία* that the Meletians had just professed; so the document of the *κοινωνία*, the expanded Nicaenum, had to give way to the document of agreement with Paulinus. The latter now appeared as the unfolding of Nicene faith. It is difficult to decide whether the note on the Roman extension of N was left out by mistake or on purpose. In any case, we can be glad that most of the old [496] scribes were not of Turner's opinion, but faithfully copied what was there.

7 Theodor on the "ecumenical" synod

We now return to Theodore's 9th homily and take up the first paragraph where we last left off. After mentioning the Eastern signature under the Roman letter, the catechist declares the section added "subsequently" (subsequently in relation to Nicaea) to be a legitimate addition:

"If you look closely, you will find that they took their inspiration from the blessed who came from everywhere to Nicaea in the first synod".

The next historical allusion is in § 14 of the same speech, as already noted. The speaker first summarizes the content of the previous pages and then goes on to describe how "these teachers of the Church", who came together "from all creation", dealt with the question of the Holy Spirit.

"From all creation" reflects the Greek *οικουμενική* in the case of the Synod of Nicaea, so the same Greek word is to be assumed here. The Synodal Letter of 382 also uses the adjective "ecumenical" for the Synod of 381⁵⁰. There is no question that the Synod of section 14 is the Synod of Constantinople, even if the name is not mentioned.

The problem of the spirit had to be dealt with there, says Theodor, because bad people had the cheek to use the terms "servant" and "creature"

⁴⁹ In Alexandria, the "sufficiency" of N meant that those who converted from Homoerism to the Nicene faith should not be required to sign the "Western" *Serdicence*. In fact, however, a false teaching about the spirit is already being rejected, cf.

M. Tetz, *On Nicene Orthodoxy*. The so-called *Tomus ad Antiochenos* of Athanasius of Alexandria, in: ZNW 66 (1975), 194-222; here 200 f.

⁵⁰ Theodoret 293, 21.

for the Spirit⁵¹; others did not go so far, but were not convinced of the necessity of calling the Spirit God. For this reason, "the teachers of the Church, heirs of the first blessed Fathers", were forced to make the intention of the Fathers clear. They proved the truth of the faith in "careful investigation" by explaining the opinion of the Fathers. They wrote to warn the faithful, and they destroyed heretical error. And as their fathers did in the confession of the Son by combating Arius, so they did for us by speaking of the Holy Spirit and combating those who reviled him.

This last comparison between the statements of the Nicaenum on the Son and those of the Synod of 381 on the Spirit easily leads to the identification of the activities of the Synod with the production of C. Now it has long been noticed that the third article of C does not entirely, or at least not explicitly, meet the requirements of the refutation of the various forms of subordination of the Spirit. C *does not* call the spirit *ὁμοούσιον*, *not* God, the titles "servant" and "creature" are not explicitly rejected. All this happened in the To[497]mus of 379/381, as can be seen from the summary in the letter of 382. And in 382 continuity with Nicaea is claimed, and it is stated that the new heresies were placed under anathema.

8 Theodore's confession, the Roman formula and C.

We have seen that in the first section of Homily 9, Theodore quotes Article III of the Confession from the pure Nicaenum, in a departure from his usual practice. In section 16 he now quotes the same line in the form: "And to *a* Holy Spirit", which represents a difference not only to the Nicaenum, but also to

C. "A holy spirit" is certainly formulated analogously to "*a* God" and "*a* Lord" of the first two articles, while C in this colon remains with the text of the pure Nicene.

What does Theodore himself say about this difference? He begins: "So now, therefore" (namely because of what was said theologically in section 15) "in this understanding our blessed Fathers confessed in their confession that the Holy Spirit is of divine nature with the Father and the Son; and by adding *a few words* they confirmed the teaching of the Church ... by saying 'And in the *one* Holy Spirit'". At first it seems that in the lines just quoted the grammatical subject of both sentences is the same; in order to avoid this impression, Tonneau translates the second sentence in an impersonal form, and he also makes a note on "*a few words*", which reads: "That is to say: (added) 'by the Fathers of the Council of Constantinople'"⁵²381.

⁵¹ Cf. the entrance to the Tomus Damasi.

⁵² Tonneau 239 n. 1.

Tonneau is influenced not only by the usual understanding of § 14, but above all by the usual assumption that it was the Council of 381 to which we owe C. But Tonneau is right in dividing the two propositions into two different subjects. But Tonneau is right in dividing the two sentences between two different subjects. But it is clear from § 1 that "they", who wrote the addition, were the members of the Western Synod and must therefore also be the subject of the sentence in question here. In Theodore's next sentence, too, two subjects must be distinguished, both of which are called "they": Theodore insists that the talk of the "one Holy Spirit" is nothing other than that of the "Holy Spirit"; "they" explain what "they" have said⁵³.

It's frustrating that we don't hear more from Theodor about the addition of the III. article than the notice of the "addition of a few words" and that one of them was "unum" before "spiritum [498] sanctum". The piece on the Holy Spirit in Theodore's Symbol is actually shorter than in C, it reads only: Καὶ εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας⁵⁴, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν, - so for his own confession Theodore can rightly speak of "a few words". Did the Western addition consist of the same words?

Of course, Theodore is not writing a treatise on the study of symbols, but an introduction to the Christian faith. But why does he say so much about the difference of the "unum spiritum" between the pure Nicaenum and the supplemented Credo, while he says nothing about the differences in Article II and does not specifically justify the other additional statements about the Spirit? Is the reason that a difference in the wording at the beginning of an article is so much more conspicuous than in other places? On the other hand, the reference to the agreement with the West is easy to understand from the Antiochene situation, since it is a question of the agreement between the *Nine Nations* and Rome. It was not superfluous to remind the ancient Nicaeans of this, who could boast of κοινωνία with Rome, even if the brief phase of Meletian κοινωνία with the West had already been ended by Rome.

A few conclusions of a symbolic-historical nature can at least be drawn from Theodor's information⁵⁵. *Firstly*, the expanded Nicaenum, as sent from Rome to Antioch, contained the expression "et in *unum* spiritum sanctum". *Secondly*, Theodore's symbol can be related to the Roman formula - if only we knew to what extent he reproduced it! *Thirdly*, if we think of the line πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως in Theodore's Credo

⁵³ It is to be assumed that either the Syriac translation or its Hsl. It can be assumed that either the Syriac translation or its Hsl. transmission no longer recognized the difference. Although Syriac does not have the same wealth of pronominal forms as Greek, a differentiation by diacritics would be possible.

points would have been possible.

⁵⁴ For the affiliation of this colon to Theodor's symbol, see Appendix B below.

⁵⁵ Of course, the mere *existence* of Theodor's symbol already has consequences for the history of symbols, see below Appendix A.

and the possible reasons for their inclusion in the symbol, then we must reckon with the fact that Theodore adapted the confession to the catechetical necessities of the Antiochian situation. *Fourthly*, the similarities between Theodore and the Western formula in the matter of the "unum spiritum sanctum" on the one hand and the difference with C on the other prove that C cannot be completely identical with the Western formula either. At this point in our reflections, it is useful to find a name for the lost symbol that the Western Synod sent to Antioch: *Romano-Nicaenum* seems appropriate to me.

In the series of Theodore's baptismal speeches, the interesting remarks in Homily 9 on the development of the Nicaenum into the Romano-Nicaenum are an exception. In Homily 10, as in Homilies 1-8, the "blessed fathers" (i.e. those of Nicaea) are again the authors of Theodore's symbol, including the additions. Take this passage from the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd paragraph in Homily 10: "... fittingly our *blessed Fathers* thought that they should confirm the doctrine of piety by a brief addition for all men, and still more for you who are about to draw near to the gift of the Spirit. For what did they say? 'And to a Holy Spirit'".

If, for ease of handling, we also divide Article III into a) and b) and first consider Art. IIIb, it will probably meet with general agreement if we assume, on the basis of C and Theodor's symbol *and* the Romanum itself, that Art. IIIb (unlike in N) was also present in the Romano-Nicaenum and secondly contained the key words church, baptism, forgiveness of sins, resurrection and eternal life. If Theodore's creed actually spoke of the resurrection of the *flesh* (and not just of the body), it would be closer to the Romanum and thus certainly also to the Romano-Nicaenum than C (resurrection of the *dead*)⁵⁶.

As far as the predicates of the spirit in Art. III a, the Tomus Damasi, in combination with the two symbols whose text we have, helps us to draw conclusions in one direction or the other. In the second series of condemnations in this document one reads (Turner p. 291,117-123)⁵⁷:

- 1 Si quis tres personas non dixerit veras, Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti,
- 2 aequals
- 3 semper viventes
- 4 omnia continentes visibilia et invisibilia
- 5 omnia potentes
- 6 omnia iudicantes
- 7 omnia vivificantes

⁵⁶ On the problem of syr. *pagrā* as a translation of σῶμα *and* σάρξ, see Appendix B below.

⁵⁷ The decomposition into colas and their counting is mine.

8 omnia facientes

9 omnia salvantes: haereticus est.

This passage works on the same principle of intra-Trinitarian predication as the theological summary of 382: predicates characteristic of some of the Trinitarian persons are attributed to all persons. I postulate that in the Romano-Nicaenum it was the Spirit who was predicated as "life-giving", [500] following the analogy of C and Theodore, and that from there

"vivificantes" in line 7 above.

Could one also solve another difficulty with the help of the Damasian sequence? I mean the derivation of the strange adjective for the spirit, which only has C (Theodor does not). In my opinion, *κύριον* is to be translated as "powerful", in the sense of

"sovereign". I assume that the Romano-Nicaenum read: *et in unum spiritum sanctum, potentem et vivificantem*. We see above in the Damasian text that the predicate *omnipotens*, which belongs to the first person of the Trinity in a tripartite confession, is broken down into its constituent parts (5), appears as an analogy to the other divine attributes that concern "everything" and is attributed to all three persons. Therefore, it would again be possible to attribute it to a single one of the three persons to whom it was not originally attributed. The Greek translation of *potens* could not work with a participle or adjective of the stems *δύναμαι* or *ἐνεργέω*, because this would not have provided a weapon against pneumatozization and would not have gone beyond the idea of the spirit as a mere force.

As far as Theodore is concerned, he concludes his teaching on the Holy Spirit with Mt 28, here interpreted as an indication of the *unity* of the divine nature. Those converted from polytheism turn to this unity (Homily 10 §§ 13 and 14). The catechist has thus returned to the starting point of his teaching on the Trinity, only he had seen the doctrine of the three hypostases founded in the baptismal command at the beginning. Mt 28 thus provides him with evidence for the two aspects of the doctrine of the Trinity, for the Trinity and the unity, and the author Theodore has succeeded in giving his explanations the appropriate *inclusio*.

9 From Romano-Nicaenum to the "Confession of the 150 Fathers" in Chalcedon

Both Theodore's symbol and C are based on the Romano-Nicaenum; in the lines on the Incarnation they complement each other, perhaps in other places as well. Theodore's formula, although later than C, seems to be closer to the Romano-Nicaenum in some respects.

One would actually expect that a formula of faith that is sent out to be confirmed, as was the case with the western extended Nicaenum in its transmission to Antioch, would be repeated verbatim in the reply letter.

But the evidence of the Theodore formula rules out the complete literal identity of C with the Romano-Nicaenum. The question is, however, whether literal identity was a need of the time at all. After all, the formula coming from Rome already represented a modification of the pure Nicaenum, not only in the third article, but also in the second, where the pure Nicae[501]num and the Romanum can easily be pushed into one another. Was it not possible to subject this form of the Confession to further editing? I hypothesize that C is the form that was given to the Romano-Nicaenum at the Meletian Synod in Antioch. At this point my argument coincides again with Staats'.

As a formulation of the Meletian Synod, C was already a symbol of the (fairly accurate) "150 Fathers", although regarded by them and by others in the following decades as a Nicene symbol. It is clear from the letter of the Synod of 382 that there is complete continuity in the doctrine of the Trinity from the great Meletian Synod of 379 in Antioch to the two Synods of 381 and 382 in Constantinople. There can be no doubt that the documents of the Synod of 379, which according to my theory must have contained C, were approved in Constantinople and included in the dossier of 381; the documents of 382 were probably added in turn.

Such a derivation from C would give this symbol a greater significance in terms of its origin than the merely marginal role that Ritter's explanation had to ascribe to it.

The traces of knowledge of C before 451 have been discussed again and again. Apparently they are mostly connected with Constantinople. Between Theodore and Nestorius as bishop of Constantinople there is the surprising difference of their reference to the "Nicaenum" in the lines about the Incarnation⁵⁸. This difference corresponds to that between Theodore and C: Theodore has γεννηθέντα among the incarnation statements⁵⁹, C (and N!) does not⁶⁰. This is the problem of the "second birth of the Logos", which Nestorius regarded as inappropriate to the divine nature. Nestorius argues with C, which he naturally understands as a Nicene symbol,

⁵⁸ On this *Lebon* 843-845 with a decisive improvement of a Nestorius fragment printed by Loofs; following him *Ritter* 198-200.

⁵⁹ But one must also read Theodore's provisos when he uses the "born" of Art.

IIb explains: "Il est certain que ce ne fut pas la nature divine du (Fils) Unique qu'ils pensent être née d'une femme, comme si de là elle eût eu (son) commencernent"; the one born of the Father does not have his beginning from Mary; the Fathers follow the Scriptures, which speak of the natures differently, while they teach a person on the basis of the "exact συνάφεια" ("exact" has the sense of "perfect"). But the scriptures use both expressions of the *one* Son to show the glory of the only begotten and also the honor of the man with whom he was clothed.

⁶⁰ I think it is possible that it was the influence of Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus since 378, that was responsible for this.

ensured that the Roman γεννηθέντα was not included in Art. IIb of C; compare below in Appendix A a) how an Antiochian formulates when he does not adhere to a given template.

and not with the symbol explained by Theodore, even though Nestorius came from Antiochia⁶¹.

The theological speeches given by Gregory of Nazianzus in Constantinople show that there was every reason to spread the correct doctrine of the Trinity among the clergy and the people in the imperial capital. For the further instruction of the faithful after 381, C could be much more useful for the Nicene-minded clergy than the much longer and more demanding *Tomus* of 379/381. It will be assumed that the Acts of 379/381/382 were the direct or indirect source for local knowledge of the symbol. How far did knowledge of C extend beyond the sphere of influence of the Church of Constantinople? In Egypt, at any rate, it was not known⁶², and the Cyrillic party took Nestorius to task for the fact that his reference to the Nicaenum used formulations (namely those from the Romano-Nicaenum in Art. II b!) that were not to be found in the pure Nicaenum. This led to the decision of the Cyrillic Synod in Ephesus 431 that nothing should be added to the Nicaenum.

At Chalcedon 451, the symbol of "the 150 Fathers", now designated as such for the first time, was included from the outset in the strategy of the Council's leadership, insofar as this strategy aimed at a definition of faith⁶³; there were thus officials who knew of its existence as a supplement to N or had been made aware of it.

I wonder whether it means something that up to and including the 3rd session no place name is given for the "Faith of the 150 Fathers" (in the "Faith of the 318 Fathers" the place name is sometimes given, but not always). Only in the 4th session is the "confirmation" of the "faith of the 318" by the "150 Fathers" localized in Constantinople, at the synod "under the great Theodosius", and we hear this first from the mouths of the Roman legates (no. 6) and *then* (no. 8) from the imperial commissioners⁶⁴. Could it not be that in the meantime the Romans had inquired about the origin of the credo of the 150 and that on *this* occasion it was attributed to the imperial synod in order to give it greater weight?

The fact that the baptismal confession of the Nicene community of Antioch, which Theodore explains, remains so close to Romano-Nicaenum at this point must have something to do with the peculiar ecclesiastical situation in the capital of the diocese of Oriens.

⁶¹ How this could be used against Nestorius is shown in the *Contestatio* Eusebii, see below Appendix A b).

⁶² Cf. *Ritter* 204 n. 1.

⁶³ Cf. *ibid.*, 174.

⁶⁴ ACO II 1 289,20-31 and 289,36-290,3 (I use the consecutive page numbering; *Ritter* uses indicate the page numbers of the individual fascicles of II 1). The translation of no. 6, line 25 οὔτινος - 27 ἀσπάζεται by A. J. Festugière (*Actes du concile de Chalcédoine* [Cahiers d'Orientalisme 4] Geneva 1983, 42) is misleading (Ephesus "a semblablement embrassé l'exposé de foi du concile de Constantinople") but perhaps only due to an oversight by the translator in this work, which was only published after his death.

Under the prevailing circumstances, it is not surprising that nothing was said about the original function of the formula as a document of a [503] union of the Nicenes with the West (soon abolished by the West) and about the Roman part in the text. All this had obviously been forgotten in Rome in the meantime; and in Antioch the union of the two Nicene parties, which had taken place some time ago, had healed the wounds there.

The citation of C in the Tomus of Chalcedon justifies the drafting and publication of this council's Christological definition, which many council participants had opposed with reference to Ephesus 431. The ephe- sinic prohibition is thus tacitly corrected. According to its literary form (in that it does not take the declaratory form of the Baptismal Creed as its model), the Chalcedon definition does not have its comparative text in C, but in the Tomus of 379/381. And it is in the latter, i.e. in the abridged version of 382, which is the only one still accessible to us, that we have to look for the "theology of the ecumenical Council of Constantinople" that is so often invoked. It could only be useful for the ecumenical discussion to pay attention to the similarities between this Tomus and the contemporaneous Roman documents, as well as to the Roman origin and the Nicene acceptance of the Romano-Nicaenum on which C is based.

Appendix A: On the "Symbol of the Church of Antioch" (Hahn § 130, Denzinger/Schönmetzer no. 50)

A problem pointed out by Dossetti (p. 281, in the note) is that of "the relations between the symbol commented on by Theodore and the ancient baptismal symbol of Antioch, which we know through partial citations from St. John Chrysostom, the Ephesian Council and Cassian (cf. Hahn § 130), to which some formulas must be added, to be obtained from a paraphrase of the symbol contained in a recently published catechesis of St. John Chrysostom (Jean Chrysostome, Huit catéchèses baptismales inédites, ed. A. Wenger, SC 50, Paris 1957, p. 118-

119). Usually one is under the impression of the differences that appear between the two texts, so that one draws from them an argument against the attribution of Theodore's catecheses to the author's Antiochian period (see Ritter, *Das Konzil ...*, p. 1533) and one sees in the symbol he comments on 'the symbol of Mopsuestia'. I believe that the question deserves a more detailed examination". So much for Dossetti. Ritter says in the above-mentioned passage "that the from" Theodor's "The symbol that can be reconstructed from quotations deviates remarkably from the wording of the Antiochene, as far as we know". Ritter does not mention the summary of faith from Wenger's catecheses at this point. We begin with the aforementioned passage from Chrysostom's "Eight Catecheses".

[504] a) **The regula fidei of John Chrysostom in the Wenger catecheses**

These baptismal speeches were still delivered in Antioch. Wenger dates them to around 390 (p. 63 f.); they would therefore possibly still fall within the period of Theodore's Antiochian ministry. It would be very interesting to coordinate the chronological distribution of the "Eight Catecheses" attempted by Wenger with the chronology of Theodore's teaching. Obviously, several clerics were involved in the baptismal instruction. For the Easter week, i.e. for the post-Baptismal catecheses, this can be seen from Catechesis VIII of Chrysostom (see Wenger p. 47). In one of the discourses edited by A. Papa-dopoulos-Kerameus (St. Petersburg 1909), Chrysostom says: "But we leave the discourse on faith to the teacher" (Wenger p. 94 n. 2). It is of course tempting to assume that the didaskalos is, for example, the colleague Theodore, but according to Wenger, the "teacher" in the singular is "the teacher par excellence in the Christian community, i.e. the bishop" (p. 94, also p. 247 n. 2); the bishop of this time is Flavian.

In the first catechesis, St. John Chrysostom "briefly presents the main articles of faith to the catechumens" (Wenger p. 91), namely in I 19-24. §§ 19 and 24 have only an introductory and concluding function; it is sufficient to consider the section in between. I give only the decisive sentences in Greek and quote Wenger's translation for the rest; the resulting incorrect grammatical connection to Art. I of the Confession.

§ 20 Since the foundation of the piété is the faith, well, let us say to you some words of this foundation so that, after having posed this unbreakable foundation, we can then empty all our substance without fear. It is therefore necessary for those who enlist in this special, spiritual militia,

(I) πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεόν,
τὸν πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
τὸν πάντων αἵτιον,
τὸν ἄφραστον, τὸν ἀπερινόητον,
τὸν οὔτε λόγῳ οὔτε διανοίᾳ ἐρμηνευθῆναι δυνάμενον.
§ Section 21 (IIa) Καὶ εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν
Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ μονογενῆ,
τὸν κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον καὶ ἴσον τῷ πατρὶ
καὶ ἀπαράλλακτον ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁμοίότητα,
τὸν ὁμοούσιον καὶ ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει γνωριζόμενον,
τὸν ἀρρήτως ἐξ αὐτοῦ προελθόντα,
τὸν χρόνων ἀνώτερον καὶ αἰώνων ἀπάντων δημιουργόν,
(IIb) ἐν ὑστέροις δὲ καιροῖς διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν
[505] μορφήν δούλου ἀναλαβόντα καὶ ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον
καὶ συναναστραφέντα τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ φύσει
καὶ σταυρωθέντα καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα.

§ 22 Il faut avoir ces vérités bien ancrées dans votre esprit pour n'être pas le proie facile des séductions diaboliques. Mais si les tenants d'Arius veulent vous faire trébucher, sachez bien que vous devrez vous boucher les oreilles à leur discours et leur répondre avec assurance en leur montrant ὅμοιον κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν ὄντα τῷ πατρὶ τὸν υἱόν. Car c'est lui-même qui a dit: "Comme le Père resuscite les morts et les rend à la vie, ainsi le Fils fait vivre qui il veut à la vie", καὶ διὰ πάντων δείκνυσιν ὅτι τὴν ἴσην ἔχει τῷ πατρὶ δύναμιν. Si d'un autre côté, Sabellius essaie de corrompre les saines croyances συναλείφων τὰς ὑποστάσεις, ferme aussi les oreilles, bien aimé, à ses discours et apprends-lui ὡς ἡ μὲν οὐσία πατὴρ καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος μία, τρεῖς δὲ ὑποστάσεις. Le Père en effet ne saurait être appelé Fils, ni le Fils appelé Père, ni l'Esprit Saint autrement que de son nom même, ἀλλ' ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ μένων ὑποστάσει τὴν ἴσην δύναμιν κέκτηται.

§ 23 Il faut en effet que cette autre vérité soit fixée dans notre pensée, ὅτι καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τῆς αὐτῆς ἀξίας ἐστίν, selon la parole du Christ à ses disciples: "Allez, enseignez toutes les nations et baptisez-les, au nom du Père et du Fils et du Saint-Esprit."

What is striking about Chrysostom's expositions is the change in literary form: first he speaks in the familiar form of the Creed, albeit not in its declarative form, but in that of the *regula fidei* (πιστεύειν); Articles I, IIa and IIb follow one another in a clearly delineated manner. Then, however, the speaker moves on to a *raisonnement* on the Trinity, and within this instruction and exhortation, which is also an armament for the defense against false doctrine, the Spirit is spoken of at the end. The section on the doctrine of the Trinity (§§ 22.23) recalls the theological summary of 382 several times in its key words. Like Theodore, Chrysostom accentuates the *Nicene* doctrine of the Trinity; the fact that the Son is "recognized in his own hypostasis" is even included in Art. IIa and balances the homoousion there. (We also hear of the one *ousia* of Father, Son and Spirit and of the ἀδιάκριτος τριάς in II 26).

In view of the confession declared by Theodore and the polemics of the two enemies of Nestorius, which we will discuss in the next section, it is interesting to note that Chrysostom, in Art. IIb Chrysostom *does not* use γεννηθέντα; having noticed this, one realizes that it is also missing in Art. IIa is also missing. In Art. IIa there is an active participle for γεννηθέντα: προελθόντα; in Art. IIb also contains an active expression, the colon μορφὴν δούλου ἀναλαβόντα derived from Phil 2. (It is, moreover, conceivable that the latter rather follows the Nicene passive [506] σαρκωθέντα, since it immediately follows the Nicene colon "for the sake of our salvation"). All this is certainly theological intention: nothing happens to the Son, but he is also the active subject of the Incarnation; only the crucifixion is a suffering, see the passive participle.

What Chrysostom presents in this catechesis as the content of faith is independent of the confession interpreted by Theodore, even if it falls naturally into the *form* of the creed. But there is no reason to conclude that

It can be concluded that only one of the two could have held his catechesis in Antioch. Art. I and II of Chrysostom cannot be identified either. Rather, they are to be regarded as his personal formulation. With his statements on the Trinity and implicitly on the Spirit, which are linked to warnings against heresies, he follows the mandate of the Council of Constantinople, of which Theodore reports (*see section 7 above*).

b) The excerpts from the "Symbol of the Church of Antioch" in Euseb (of Doryläum) and John Cassian

The "Confession of the Church of Antioch" in the Contestatio (or Obtestatio) (ACO I 1,1 p. 101 f.) of the *agens in rebus* Eusebius, the later Bishop of Doryläum, and in the writing *De incarnatione domini contra Nestorium* by John Cassian (ed. Petschenig, CSEL 17, 1888, p. 235-391) is nothing more than an abridged excerpt from the same confession that Theodore interprets in his catecheses. Decisive for this identification are the cola from Col 1:15 and Heb 10:7, which appear in exactly the same places in Art. IIa of the Confession as in Theodore (Heb 10:7 is rarely found in confessions anyway). In order to clarify this relationship, I have included the "Confession of Antioch" in the reconstructed text of Theodore's Confession (*see below 513 f. [here in this volume p. 361 f. - ed.]*); for convenience, each line is numbered in both comparative texts. I have marked the excess in relation to Theodor with square brackets, the missing with pointed brackets

Parentheses. Differences with regard to *καί* and "et" at the beginning of d not Kola are taken into account.

- | | | |
|-------|----|---|
| I | 1 | Credo in unum [et solum verum] deum, |
| | 2 | patrem omnipotentem |
| | 3 | creatorem omnium visibilium et invisibilium [creaturarum] |
| II a | 4 | et in <unum> dominum [nostrum] Jesum Christum |
| | 5 | filium eius < instead of: dei> unigenitum |
| | 6 | et primogenitum totius creaturae, |
| | 7 | ex eo <instead of: e patre eius> natum ante omnia saecula |
| | 8 | et non factum, |
| | 9 | θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, |
| [507] | 10 | ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ <αὐτοῦ>, |
| | 11 | δι' οὗ οἱ αἰῶνες κατηρτίσθησαν καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο |
| II b | 12 | τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς <2 words omitted> |
| | 13 | <5 words omitted> κατέλθοντα <3 words omitted> |
| | 14 | <2 words omitted> |
| | 15 | <3 Words omitted> |
| | 16 | καὶ γεννηθέντα ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς [ἀγίας] [τῆς ἀεὶ] παρθένου |

- 17 καὶ σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου,
 18 et sepultus
 19 et tertia die ressurexit secundum scripturas
 20 et ascendit in caelos
 21 <5 words omitted>
 22 et iterum veniet
 23 iudicare vivos et mortuos.

It is remarkable that not even in this case, in which Nestorius is to be refuted by an authoritative text, there is complete literalness or literalism. There are not only omissions, but also additions; of course, the additions are mostly epitheta ornantia.

Why John Cassian has more text than Euseb, who is his source, has E. Schwartz in his *Konzilstudien* (Strasbourg 1914, p. 1-17) explains: Euseb not only sent his *Contestatio* to Rome, but also the material from which he had taken his quotations (ibid. p. 16). In lines 12-16 of our count, where more text has been omitted than taken over, Cassian does not read more words than Euseb himself offers; he has thus received the Confession in Euseb's preparation (this in correction to Schwartz, p. 16, "he enclosed in extenso"; Schwartz did not yet know Theodore's catecheses at that time).

The abridgements have brought parts a) and b) of the Second Article to approximately the same length; and the short excerpt in Euseb is also symmetrical in itself. The motive for the abridgement (of which Euseb says nothing and of which Cassian knows nothing) is clear from the very interesting introduction to the *Contestatio* (ACO I 1,1 p. 102,1-8; lines 3-8 can also be found in Greek - according to an older edition - in Hahn, n. 400 to § 130). I quote here the German translation by M. Tetz (zum Streit zwischen Orthodoxie und Häresie an der Wende des 4. zum 5. Jahrhundert, *Evangelische Theologie* 21, 1961, p. 354-368; the translation of the *Contestatio* p. 355 f.). The beginning of the quotation refers to the previous comparison of Nestorius' quotations with those of Paul of Samosata (the latter certainly not genuine). Tetz p. 356 (emphasis mine): "Thus it is clearly shown how the impious man says: *the begotten of God was not born of Mary*; he therefore agrees with Paul the [508] heretic, for he says: one is the Logos and another Jesus Christ, and he is not one, as orthodoxy teaches. Therefore I excerpt for you, you champion of the holy faith, a passage from the *Confession of the Church of Antioch*, whence also our Christian name comes, for it does not recognize two sons of God, but one who *was begotten* before all eons *as God of God the Father*, ὁμοούσιος the Father, and *the same* as the one *born* under Emperor Augustus *of the Virgin Mary*; it reads:"

The symbol was thus trimmed by Euseb in Art. IIb, so that the statement of the twofold birth of the Logos, which was his sole concern, should come forward clearly.

In support of his argument, Euseb includes in the *Contestatio* a quotation from Eustathius of Antioch, one of "the 318 bishops of the holy and

great synod". Tetz (p. 362) found the quotation in the Ps.-athanasian (= Marcellasian) writing "De incarnatione et contra Arianos". The quotation consists largely of the biblical passage Bar 3:36-38; this ends: καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναναστρέφη, which is explained in the smaller remainder of the quotation: πότε σ υ ν α ν ε σ τ ρ ά φ η , εἰ μὴ ὅτε ... It is the same baruch line that underlies a colon in John Chrysostom (cf. above 505 [here in this volume p. 353 - *the ed.*]).

John Cassian, for his part, developed the argument from the reference to Antioch, "where the Christians first received their name", that this symbol contains the universal church, the Catholic faith. The corresponding passages from lib. VI c. 3.5.6 are reported in Hahn, n. 402 to § 130b. If one remembers that the Confession in Theodore's catecheses rests on the Romano-Nicaenum, Cassian's judgment is not wrong - but not without historical irony, if one looks at the history of the transmission of the catecheses and of the Confession ("Nestorianum"). To the credit of the Latin theologians, it must be said that a hundred years after Cassian they resisted the condemnation of the Three Chapters and thus of Theodore for a long time.

The derivation of Euseb's and Cassian's quotations from the symbol commented on by Theodore definitively proves that the interpreter gave his teachings in Antioch as a presbyter and not only in Mopsuestia as a bishop. Euseb's accusatory recourse to the Confession of the Church of Antioch, prompted by the impossibility of refuting Nestorius in his rejection of a second birth *of the Logos* from the literal wording in N or C (neither *have γεννηθέντα* in Art. II b), can mean nothing other than that around this time, in 428 or 429, the Confession declared by Theodore was still the baptismal symbol of the Antiochian Church. If only we had a comparable message about C and its use in Constantinople!

[509] Appendix B: The text of Theodor's Symbol

For a better understanding of the main part of this essay, a parallel print of C and Theodore's symbol is given at the end. But a few preliminary remarks are necessary on the latter, which, according to what was said in Appendix A, was the symbol of the Church of Antioch for at least 45 years. Since Theodore does not quote the Confession in one piece, uncertainties arise when the typical citation formulas with which the catechist establishes the connection between the cola are missing. Such remarks are, for example: "... and after they had said: '...', they added: '...'". In the explanation of Article III on the spirit and the eschata there are too few of these aids, and so the reconstructions differ most strongly here.

There are three reconstructions, two of which are Greek retroversions:

a) Greek: A. Rücker, *Ritus baptismi et missae, quem descripsit Theodorus ep. Mopsuestenus in sermonibus catecheticis* (Opuscula et textus ... ser. liturgica 2), Münster 1933, p. 43 f.;

b) Greek: J. Lebon, *Les anciens symboles dans la définition de Chalcedoine*, RHE 32 (1936), p. 836 (the whole essay p. 809-876) - without knowledge of a);

c) French: to be composed from the italicized lines in Tonneau's table of contents of the catecheses, p. 619-621.

Lebon's version is printed in Denzinger/Schönmetzer, with two changes. Dossetti (p. 279 note) says of the two Greek retroversions:

"non sono prive di mende". He then discusses necessary changes to Lebon's version. He does not mention Tonneau's reconstruction.

It is not necessary to print all the versions; I am only discussing individual passages. Rücker and Lebon, of course, immediately noticed the extraordinarily close relationship of the symbol in Theodore to the "Nestorianum", which Caspari had retranslated into Greek, and took Caspari's choice of words as the basis of their work (Lebon says this explicitly, l.c. p. 836 n. 2). Rücker has more connections with καί than the other reconstructions, but I do not list them; compare Lebon's remarks on the problem of retroversions; he does not pretend, "as is self-evident," to be "exact down to the smallest elements of the original, such as articles and conjunctions, in the translation of which the Oriental versions are sometimes deficient or idiosyncratic. It is also known that the Greek participles are often rendered there by personal forms of the verb" (ibid.).

In Rücker's version, ἐκ νεκρῶν is to be deleted after the resurrection of Christ "on the third day according to the Scriptures". Rücker also writes according to the East Syriac sequence "to judge the dead and the living". [510] Theodore, however, quotes Hom. 7

§ 11 (p. 176 line 10) the Greek order "living and dead"; as de Halleux has noted, the translator (in my opinion it could also have been a copyist) has fallen into his own habit in lines 14 and 17 ("dead and living"): A. de Halleux, *La Philoxénienne du symbole*, in: *Symposium Syriacum 1976* (OCA 205, 1978)

p. 295-318; here p. 298 (de Halleux's references to "p. 178" and line "12" should be corrected as above). At the very end of the confession Rücker has "Auferstehung der Leiber", whereas the Syriac offers the singular.

In contrast to Rücker, *Lebon* was influenced by the "Nestorianum" to begin the symbol with the first person of the *plural*. However, the singular has even been handed down by John Cassian (see Appendix A above) and gave Hahn cause for n. 403 to § 130b. In the 1st article, Lebon omitted θεόν before πατέρα (see also Dossetti p. 279 n. on this), which is probably an oversight; in Denz./Schönm. this is tacitly corrected. Lebon begins Article IIIb with [ὁμολογοῦμεν] ἐν βάπτισμα (in Denz./Schönm. the square brackets are omitted) and then follows with the cola on the Church and the forgiveness of sins. Lebon thus attempts to do justice to the apparent order of the topoi in Theodore; he also found "we believe a baptism" in the "Nestorianum", although the factually more correct sequence appears in the "Nestorianum": church, baptism, forgiveness of sins (cf. the discussion in Dossetti p. 279 n.).

In order to clarify whether Lebon's order is justified, we must take a closer look at the transition from § 14 to § 15 in Theodore's Hom. 10. § 14 is still an interpretation of Christ's command to baptize; the command to baptize teaches about the one nature of Father, Son and Spirit and commands baptism in the name of these three. The paragraph ends: "Et il faut que nous, en ces noms de Père, Fils et Esprit-Saint dits au baptême, nous attendions d'être rénovés et recevoir une libération véritable". § 15 begins: "Et en conséquence encore, à la profession baptismale ils ajoutèrent aussi la profession de la foi une Église catholique" (I have omitted Tonneau's citation mark around "eine katholische Kirche"). From this sentence it is easy to see how Lebon arrived at his colon "[we believe] a baptism": he derived it from "profession baptismale". But "baptismal profession" means, according to the foregoing, confession of the Father, Son and Spirit, in accordance with Christ's command, i.e. in the symbol the articles I, II and IIIa. This is confirmed by § 19 (beginning) of the same homily, where Theodore says: "Therefore each of us confesses 'I believe and am baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit in the one Church, the catholic, holy'" (§ 21, however: "holy, catholic"). The first, Trinitarian half of the statement here again stands for the articles I, II and IIIa of the baptismal symbol; the second half links the first line of IIIb with the preceding text to form the idea that the catechist develops below. The predicates of the Church are presented in the order "holy", "catholic", "one" at the end of § 19.

In the last line of the symbol, Lebon retroverts "the resurrection of the body" as ἀνάστασιν σαρκός. This would bring Theodore's symbol even closer to the Romano-Nicaenum. The prerequisite for Lebon's retranslation is the fact that the Syriac word for body, pagrā, can serve not only to translate σῶμα but also σάρξ, as in the old translations (preceding the Peschitta) of John 1:14, cf. de Halleux, *La Philoxénienne* ... p. 308. Since the Syriac translation of Theodore's Catechetical Homilies still offers the older forms of translation for those Christological terms which are derived from σάρξ (de Halleux l.c. p. 309), there is a great probability, but not complete certainty, that Lebon's retranslation in Art. IIIb is the correct one.

In his table of contents p. 621, *Tonneau* inadvertently wrote "resurrection *des* corps", correctly p. 277 "resurrection *du* corps".

Dossetti was the only one to postulate that in Art. IIIa the colon "And to a holy spirit" must be followed by τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. This is one point on which I have changed my mind since my Oxford lecture - I now agree with *Dossetti*. The colon in question is in the "Nestorianum", but this does not mean that it must necessarily have been in Theodore's symbol as well. But in Hom. 10 § 3 (middle) Theodore gives an interpretation of John 14:15 f. Then the catechist continues: In confirmation of his words Jesus added (from the plural verbum a singular is to be made with Tonneau p. 249 with n. 4), which is the dignity of the Holy Spirit, "by saying: 'the Spirit of truth' John 14:17". In § 4 Theodore speaks

about lies and truth, in § 5 he quotes passages from the Psalms about truth, in § 6 he explains what it means for us when Jesus speaks of the Spirit of truth. Then in the middle of the paragraph it says: "En sa brièveté donc ce fut un grand témoignage sur la nature de l'Esprit-Saint que nous signifia le Christ Notre-Seigneur en disant 'Esprit de vérité'." Further colas from John 14:17 are then quoted. Decisive for the affiliation of this predication of the Spirit to the text of the Confession is the beginning of § 7: "Ainsi, nos pères bienheureux dirent-ils aussi *ce mot* de l'Esprit-Saint, comme ils l'avaient reçu de Notre-Seigneur; et ils ajoutèrent encore *cet autre*: 'Celui qui procède du Père'. Ceci also had been said in Notre-Seigneur's teaching to his disciples. 'Quand viendra', dit-il, 'l'Esprit Paraclet, celui que je vous enverrai, l'Esprit de vérité, celui qui procède du Père, il rendra témoignage de moi' Joh 15,26)". According to everything that precedes it, "ce mot" can only be "Spirit of truth"; in Jn 15:26, this predicate of the Spirit precedes the colon about the Spirit's coming forth from the Father. This latter biblical passage is therefore to be regarded as the source for the "Spirit of truth" in the symbol. It is again the occurrence of the predicate in the symbol that prompted Theodore to write his treatise on the "Spirit of truth". As a good exegete, he also referred to the parallel passage in John 14 and made *this* passage the starting point of his train of thought.

One of *Dossetti's* special merits is that he traced the sources for the "Nestorianum" from the 5th century onwards (p. 279 f., n.). The oldest Antiochian-Nestorian theologian he can name is Narsai with his liturgical homilies. The relationship of his text to Theodore and his catecheses should be examined next; I hope to be able to do so in the foreseeable future.*

(a) Constantinopolitan Creed

H. Denzinger / A. Schönmetzer, *Enchiridion symbolorum* (...), Barcelona et al. ³⁶¹⁹⁷⁶, no. 150 (also ³⁷¹⁹⁹¹ Hünemann).

- | | |
|------|---|
| I | Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεόν,
πατέρα παντοκράτορα,
ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς,
ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων- |
| II a | καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ,
φῶς ἐκ φωτός,
θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, |

* [L. Abramowski, Die liturgische Homilie des Ps. Narses mit dem Messbekenntnis und einem Theodor-Zitat, BJRL 78 (1996) 87-100, here in this volume pp. 153-165, cf. p. 159 note 30. - *the ed.*].

- γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα,
 ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί,
 δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο,
 II b τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους
 καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν
 καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου καὶ
 ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,
 σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου
 καὶ παθόντα
 καὶ ταφέντα
 καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς
 καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς
 καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς
 καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης
 κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,
 οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος-
 III a καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον,
 τὸ κύριον καὶ
 ζωοποιόν,
 τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον,
 τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον
 [513] καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον,
 τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.
 III b Εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν.
 Ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.
 Προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.
 Ἀμήν.

(b) The symbol explained by Theodor von Mopsuestia,

to be gained from Catecheses I-X, slightly deviating from the text in H. Denzinger / A: Schönmetzer, *Enchiridion symbolorum* (...), Barcelona et al. ³⁶¹⁹⁷⁶, no. 51 (also 371991 Hünemann).

- I 1 Πιστεύω εἰς ἓνα θεόν,
 2 πατέρα παντοκράτορα,
 3 πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν.
 II a 4 Καὶ εἰς ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
 5 τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ,
 6 τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως (Col 1:15),
 7 τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων,
 8 οὐ ποιηθέντα,
 9 θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ,

- 10 ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ,
 11 δι' οὗ οἱ αἰῶνες κατηρτίσθησαν (cf. Heb. 1:3) καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο,
 II b 12 τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους
 13 καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν
 14 καὶ σαρκωθέντα
 15 καὶ ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον,
 16 γεννηθέντα ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου,
 17 καὶ σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου,
 18 ταφέντα
 19 καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰς τὰς γραφάς,
 20 ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς,
 21 καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ
 22 καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον
 23 κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.
 III a 24 Καὶ εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ἅγιον,
 25 πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας
 26 τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον,
 27 πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν-
 III b 28 μίαν ἐκκλησίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν,
 29 ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,
 30 ἀνάστασιν σώματος (σαρκὸς?) καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

5.3 The History of Research into Nestorius

Modern research concerning Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople 428-431, started with "Nestoriana", edited by Friedrich Loofs in 1905. The book is a collection of the extant Greek and Syriac remains, often fragments, then known. For the first time fragments of the several sermons were put together by Loofs under their headings or other characteristics, so that a picture of the preacher was beginning to emerge. Loofs's fundamental work became the point of reference for every scholar who edited writings containing quotations from Nestorius, mainly Eduard Schwartz for the Acts of the Ecumenical Councils (ACO) and Joseph Lebon for Severus of Antioch (in CSCO). The edition of Severus also added new fragments formerly unknown. The "Nestoriana" can now be brought up to date with the help of Maurice Geerard's invaluable *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, vol. III, 1979, nos. 5.665-5.766; missing in his survey are only the few quotations, partly unknown, contained in the "Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts" (see below).

In 1910 Paul Bedjan edited under the name of his real author, Nestorius, "*Le livre d'Héraclide de Damas*", the name Heraclides being of course a camouflage. In the same year already appeared the French translation of this long text, done by François Nau with the help of Bedjan himself and of M. Brière. This volume comprised also several appendixes, i.e. three complete Greek sermons by Nestorius. An English translation by G. R. Driver - and Leonard Hodgson followed in 1925, awkwardly called "*The Bazaar of Heracleides*", because the translators were evidently not aware that ܠܗܪܐܬܝܠܐ can mean *tractate*; Anastos (see below) even thought that it was a fault of the Syriac translator to use ܠܗܪܐܬܝܠܐ at all! Driver/Hodgson were reviewed by Loofs rather critically in 1926; the reviewer sketched a program of research still to be done on the book at that time, after the first flourish of publications caused by Bedjan's and Nau's foundation work had died down. It was this review which gave the idea to undertake the tasks, as listed by Loofs, myself, since nobody else had done it in the meantime. The results can be read in the second part of my monograph of 1963, a volume in the *Subsidia* of CSCO, with the title: "*Untersuchungen zum liber Heraclidis des Nestorius*".

To clear up the question of authenticity I subjected the work to literary critical analysis. Not all of the book was by Nestorius himself, but he is the author of the largest part which is his Second Apologia. At the end of the Apology I found some interpolations, presumably from the late 5th century. But more important is the fact that somebody I call Ps.-Nestorius has written a kind of introduction to the main part, in the form of a dialogue. All of this was done by Greek sympathizers, at Constantinople no doubt. To fit the Dialogue and the Second Apology together part of the original introduction by Nestorius was cut away. The demarcation line is between p. 125 and 126 of Bedjan's edition. The results of this analysis have been accepted by Grillmeier, Gribomont and de Halleux, while others tried to interpret the facts in other ways. The existence of the Dialogue is an important witness to the survival of Antiochene Christianity.

tology into the late fifth century in the Greek West. In fact it was still existing there in the 6th century.

Ps.-Nestorius develops a christological doctrine which is a variant on the teaching of Nestorius. Concerning the two prosopa in Christ which are the one prosopon he is going a step further than Nestorius: the prosopon of one nature "appropriates" the prosopon of the other nature and thus there is one prosopon, the "own" prosopon of one nature becomes the "own" prosopon of the other (and viceversa). But both authors differ completely in the use of hypostasis; the authentic Nestorius has two hypostases for the two natures in Christ, but the author of the dialogue does without the term in christological teaching - with one surprising exception. He says after having spoken of "one" and "two" in Christ: "They have difference of nature, *one* qenoma and *one* parzopa" (Bedjan p. 81,4 f.). Nau in his translation added to this, though in brackets: "(pour chaque nature)" (p. 52,11 f.), because he considered the Dialogue to be authentic and could not believe that Nestorius would use μία ὑπόστασις for the one Christ.

At this point let me digress for a moment. When Antiochene and Syriac dyophysite theologians of the 5th century take their basic formula, two natures, one prosopon, as a frame and start to develop it into the variants we find Nestorius and Ps.-Nestorius (there are further variants in the Syriac translation of Theodore of Mopsuestia, *De incarnatione* in add. 14.669, and in Narsai), they all have a common starting point. It is to be found in a single passage from Theodore's *De incarnatione*, bk. VIII, ch. 63. 63. All the elements of the later development are there, though in a rather loose connection, which explains why people felt free to go on from that in their own several ways. These elements are

[56] 1) ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο πρόσωπα ἀλλ' ἓν (in Christ), "so that there are not anymore two prosopa but one";

2) οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπρόσωπον ἔστιν ὑπόστασιν εἰπεῖν, "you may not say that hypostasis is without prosopon." This is said about the Logos and not repeated in the following sentence about the human nature - should we add it here mentally by inference?

3) the constitution of man is given as an example by Theodore: soul and body have each a nature, a hypostasis, a prosopon. The inference "therefore in Christ ..." is not drawn expressly.

Theodore evidently never worked out this sketch in another of his works, so anybody who took it up had to try and answer for instance the question for himself, *how* the two prosopa were one prosopon in Christ. So far as I can see, this special question was taken up explicitly only by Nestorius and in his wake by Ps.-Nestorius.

Later Syrians like Babai the Great and others when they speak of it are using the *Liber Heraclidis* which they of course took to be an authentic work throughout by Nestorius. In the conclusion of my monograph on the *Lib. Her.* (p. 228 f.) I pointed out the difficulties arising from the fundamental presuppositions of Nestorius. The

presuppositions are three:

1) The unity of the one Christ is a matter of course (it has been the merit of Scipioni to point this out firmly, see below) and is seen from the outside, so to speak, the one *prosopon* is a *prosopon* of doxology; it is also seen in Christ's work and reign.

2) the absolutely transcendent nature of the God Logos which cannot unite itself with human nature in a "physical" manner;

3) the full human nature without any diminution.

During his time in Constantinople Nestorius did no more than to put side by side the three elements just defined. But the description of Christ's unity "from the outside" was misunderstood to be purely external; nevertheless the polemics against the teaching of one nature and one hypostasis caused Nestorius to stress even sharper the differences of the two natures. But how to present the inner structure of the unity in Christ? The natures, unable to communicate as natures because of their definition, are to be further determined in such a way that their coming together could be understood as indivisible union. So Nestorius sharpens so to say their concept to the point of the *prosopon physikon* of each nature; the *prosopa physika* "use" each other. The mutual

"usage" cannot be conceived to be interrupted even for a moment - otherwise there would not be the "one common *prosopon* of union" of both. What Nestorius really aims at is the identity of existence of both natures. I have told you already, how much nearer Ps.-Nestorius has come to this aim (above p. 55 [here in this volume p. 363]). - So far about the *Liber Heraclidis*.

It is of course impossible to deal here with all the literature on Nestorius even of modern times. For a usefully short survey see Grillmeier in the appendix of his English "Christ in Christian Tradition" of 1965, p. 496-505, beginning with the year 517 and going on to 1963. Even for the time after 1945 I shall only mention and speak a few titles which seem to me to have advanced our understanding or are otherwise characteristic. The treatment of Nestorius and his christology by the specialists has been on the whole fair and balanced, sometimes even sympathetic.

[57] Farthest in this direction went the renowned byzantinist Milton V. Anastos, in his article in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* of 1962 "Nestorius was orthodox". It was just possible for Anastos to mention Grillmeier's paper "Das scandalum oecumenicum..." (*Scholasticism* 1961) in his notes. He finds himself "in essential agreement" with Grillmeier. "The major difference between us", Anastos continues, "is that I take Nestorius to have been *completely* orthodox, whether judged on the criterion of the Chalcedonian Symbol or from the point of view of speculative theology, whereas he" (Grillmeier) "has some reservations". Anastos takes as point of comparison not only the Chalcedonense but also the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius. In his summing up we read (p. 139): "Still, since Cyril is universally esteemed in the Church as a Chalcedonian before Chalcedon, the christology of Nestorius, if orthodox, should be reconcilable, notwithstanding angry denials on both sides, with Cyril's. In truth, it must be admitted, the line which separates them on this, as on all other issues, is either very thin or nonexistent. Both agreed that the qualities of the two natures are referable to the one person, Jesus Christ. They defined this entity somewhat differently, but it is

obvious that Cyril's 'one prosopon ... the one incarnate hypostasis of God the Logos' and Nestorius' 'one prosopon of Christ' ... were both intended to define the Jesus Christ of the Gospels. Moreover, Cyril's characteristic notion that 'the Logos suffered in the flesh' is theologically the exact equivalent of Nestorius' dogma that the Logos suffered in the prosopon of the manhood he took for his own" (this latter expression is in fact from Ps.-Nestorius). "For as we have seen ..., the prosopon of the manhood is the *schema* or the flesh and body of Jesus Christ".

Two years later appeared, in Greek, the doctoral thesis of Georgios *Bebis* (Μπέμπης): "Contributions to the research on Nestorius, from the orthodox viewpoint", Athens 1964. Evidently, for linguistic reasons, the author could not make use of Scipioni's first monograph on Nestorius of 1956; the only case where there is a reference to the content of Scipioni, it is through Grillmeier's "Das scandalum oecumenicum ...". Anastos is contradicted, and Bebis is scandalized by the connection seen by Grillmeier between Nestorius and the great Cappadocians for the use of their trinitarian distinctions between ousia, hypostasis, prosopon in christological matters. (I may add, that there are also christological expressions of Gregory Nazianzen taken up by Nestorius). The "orthodox viewpoint" of Bebis is the neo-Palamitic one. But in spite of its many weaknesses the book has the merit to be the first Greek-orthodox monograph on Nestorius. The author is interested in an ecumenical dialogue with the Nestorians. He was able to read an unpublished Nestorian B. D.-thesis from India, written in English by G. D. *Mooken*, A Re-examination of the Theology of Nestorius. With a view to assessing its relevance for today, Jahalpur 1961. I gather from Bebis's report on the thesis, that Mooken follows the opinion of Loofs, that had Nestorius been present at Chalcedon, he would have been a pillar of orthodoxy. Evidently Mooken speaks of Cyril in conciliatory language and avers quite rightly that the two opponents approached the christological problem from different viewpoints. *Bebis* himself refutes correctly the old list of heretical clichés attributed to Nestorius. Therefore he insists that Nestorius does not teach like Paul of Samosata, that he is no Pelagian, that he does not teach two Sons in Christ, that the distinction of natures is not to be conceived as a spatial one. The exchange of prosopa in the Liber Heraclidis is considered a progress compared with [58] the earlier Nestoriana. - To all of this we all of us should be able to consent and should go on from that to more positive statements.

Next I want to mention the two monographs written in Italian by the Dominican Luigi I. *Scipioni* in 1956 and 1974 respectively. The first is called "Ricerche sulla cristologia del 'Libro di Eraclide di Nestorio' with the subtitle "La formulazione teologica e il suo contesto filosofico". Of course the whole of the Lib. Her. is still taken to be authentic. That has the result, as Gribomont noted (in his review of the second monograph, p. 115), that Scipioni's picture of the christology of his hero was most lucid in the parts based on the dialogue (by Ps.-Nestorius) at the beginning of the Lib. Her. Scipioni also took the Liber de Unione of Babai the Great as a commentary on the Lib. Her., but, as Gribomont noted again (p. 113), perhaps without taking into account sufficiently the fact that Babai himself uses the Lib. Her. and therefore does not represent

an independent Antiochene tradition. Nevertheless, "Ricerche" is a very good book, not only because of his fundamentally positive view, but above all by the explanation given of the relationship between nature, hypostasis and prosopon with the help of "the Stoic position" (part III of the book) which is quite illuminating. Grillmeier is right however, when he says that all this had been absorbed already by Christian theology before Nestorius, and when he indicates the relationship with Cappadocian formulas. But there is also a precedent nearer home, in the text I quoted above already, the *De incarnatione* of Theodore, where we can constitute the series of individuation as *ousia* or *physis* - hypostasis - prosopon. The connexion between Cappadocian and Antiochene terminology is easily explained by the common position the Cappadocian and Antiochene theologians took in the trinitarian debates of the time, that is the position of neo-Nicaenism. Meletius, the bishop of Antioch, was the most important figure at the ecumenical council in Constantinople in 381, and the Catechetical Homilies of the Antiochene presbyter Theodore, the later bishop of Mopsuestia, are a powerful statement of neo-Nicaene trinitarian thinking.

Scipioni's second monograph, *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso*, of 1974, gives a lively narrative of the gripping story of Nestorius. The author's judgement on Cyril's christology is coolly critical: the Alexandrine's teaching is oldfashioned and considering the problems raised by the teaching of Apollinarius. Concerning the pseudo-Nestorian dialogue in the *Lib. Her.* Scipioni takes the position that it is written by Nestorius himself at the time of his first exile. This does not convince me at all, of course (which would not have surprised Gribomont, see *op. cit.* p. 115).

A. Grillmeier has worked on Nestorius through the continuing growth of his great work on christology and also i.a. in his paper "Das scandalum oecumenicum des Nestorius in kirchlich-dogmatischer und theologiegeschichtlicher Sicht". This paper appeared first in the journal "Scholastik" of 1961 and has been reworked and republished in the volume of Grillmeier's collected papers, "Mit ihm und in ihm", in 1975. As the title indicates, Grillmeier is distinguishing two viewpoints from the teaching of Nestorius *has* been, respectively *can* be judged: the ecclesiastical and dogmatical on one side, on the other the role of Nestorius in the history of theology. Concerning the first, resulting in the condemnation of the bishop, Grillmeier is apologetic and considers it unavoidable given the circumstances at the time, and therefore justified (p. 279 f.). But concerning the position of Nestorius in the history of theology the judgement has to be much more favourable. For Nestorius was sincerely trying to find a solution of the christological problem as it had been posed by Arianism and Apollinarianism. He is to be claimed in fact as one of the first theologians who thought out a theory of incarnation. Grillmeier notices (p. 261) the bishop's use of trinitarian terminology in christology, but in course in inversion, and asserts that nobody else had done this with so much deliberation. But this is not quite true, since Tertullian had done exactly the same more than 200 years earlier in *Adversus Praxeum* - however Tertullian was not bothered by the term "hypostasis". It is not necessary here to go into the reasons for this difference between the two theologians.

Anyhow, the method used by Nestorius is seen by Grillmeier as one to raise the discussion of the problem to the level of theological and metaphysical analysis. The ecclesiastical framework of the thinking of the bishop has to be insisted on (*ibid.*). With the exception of the term "hypostasis", Nestorius anticipated the Chalcedonian formula, for he speaks of Christ "in two natures" or of "one prosopon in two natures" (p. 263). But the passion, vehemence and impetuosity displayed in the disputes of the time blocked the way which could have led to a solution, if only there had been the possibility of common endeavor and careful analysis of arguments (p. 282). - If we are in a better position today and not so ready to hurl anathemata against each other, we may perhaps come to a better understanding.

We now come to Grillmeier's "Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche", vol. 1, third German edition of 1990 with corrections and additions. The chapters on Nestorius are arranged strictly in the chronological order of events, the treatment of the *Liber Heraclidis* is therefore to be found after the chapter on Ephesus 431.

To describe the role of Nestorius in the development of christological tradition is considered by Grillmeier to be a contribution to the theological rehabilitation of the bishop. The better we can show the orthodoxy of his teaching, the easier will be the establishment of contact with the Nestorian church of today (p. 642). About the "kerygmatic" necessity of the condemnation of Nestorius by the church Grillmeier speaks perhaps with more caution here than in the former paper. What was condemned was a "popular" presentation of a heresy and of a heretic, which corresponded more to the exigencies of the church's preaching than with historical exactitude (p. 644). Modern research has the ecumenical task to fill up the gap between what was seen as heresy and the real teaching of the condemned. The Second Vatican Council promoted just such a task (p. 645).

Of Grillmeier's chapter on the Ephesinum we may take note of the following remarks: The fathers of Ephesus did not create a new formula of faith - this refers to the synod held by Cyril of Alexandria, which won the recognition of the church. If one wants to speak of an "Ephesian symbol", there is the formula of the synod held by John of Antioch, which with some alterations became the symbolum unionis of 433. The theological center point of the Cyrillian synod was the content of the dogma of incarnation and the "heresy" of Nestorius (p. 687). Very important was the strong stress on the council and creed of Nicaea; Cyril's second letter to Nestorius was compared and found to be in conformity with it, while the answer of Nestorius was condemned as contrary to the Nicæan creed, in spite of the fact that the bishop of Constantinople had argued from it (p. 688). The lecture of the two letters by the synod is to be taken as the decisive dogmatical act of the synod. The dogmatic idea found in Nicaea by the Ephesian fathers is: "One and the same is the eternal Son [60] of the Father and the Son born according to the flesh by the Virgin Mary, who is justly called theotokos" (p. 689).

Grillmeier's chapter on the *Liber Heraclidis* I recommend as a very good description and analysis of the authentic parts of that book (p. 707-726). Grillmeier repeats

his former observation that Nestorius is really interested in a unity of being in Christ. The idea of the exchange of *prosopa* is completed by the idea of *perichoresis* (p. 722 f.). But the Cappadocian language was not sufficient to express his real meaning and he himself was not able to surmount it. However, this treatment of the problem is not too simple but too complicated: "Truth does not lie in complication" (p. 726). - At this point it may be useful to remind ourselves of a remark made by Josef Barbel concerning the insufficiency of the term *prosopon* as used by the Cappadocians and therefore by Nestorius (RHE 60, 1965, p. 499): "Naturellement, toute métaphysique de la personne fait défaut. Mais elle fait tout aussi chez Augustin. And nous-mêmes, en savons-nous aujourd'hui tellement plus?" To which we may add: Could we apply a better definition of person, should it exist, without further reflection and accommodation to the one person of Christ? The Antiochenes were very conscious of the problem. But in fact, whether we seek to define the unity of Christ on the level of nature, or hypostasis, or *prosopon*, or person in a more modern sense - in every case we have to define the term used in a special way, which is not applicable to any other though you will always, I suppose, find the special and unique application formulated as a general rule. I conclude the first part of my paper with two articles, quite recently printed, by our much regretted and truly irreplaceable colleague and friend, André de Halleux. These are: La première session du concile d'Éphèse (22 juin 431), in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 69 (1993), and: Nestorius, histoire et doctrine, in *Irénikon* 66 (1993) and p. 198 of this volume. The latter article was written for the Council of the Churches in the Middle East as de Halleux told me in his last letter - so the members of the Council here present will already know it.

To begin with the paper on Ephesus 431 and the condemnation of Nestorius, de Halleux finds that very few of the newer standard works on the history of the church and of dogma are making direct use of the material in the diverse collections of the acts as edited for the first time critically by Ed. Schwartz in ACO. The first session of Ephesus 431 especially is retold normally without taking into account the many stages of editing that a report went through, before the publicized form was reached; de Halleux speaks of a "cascade of adaptations" and the consequent loss of correspondence with the original words. For the first session of Ephesus these usual disadvantages are doubled by another circumstance: the lack of impartial verification and of official authentication. There were gathered the followers of Cyril, being by themselves after they had expelled by force the imperial commissioner whose task it was to uphold the order of the proceedings. The "editio" of the acts of this session therefore was dependant completely on the Alexandrian secretariat of the meeting. Since the imperial commissioner was of course going to submit his own report on the court, it was extremely urgent to produce as quickly as possible a report on the meeting by the actors which had to appear as keeping scrupulously close to the rules of procedure, which were those of the imperial senate (p. 48-51).

[61] De Halleux then treats his subject in two chapters dealing with the time before the inauguration of the synod and the course of the first session, respectively. He

ends with an "ecumenical conclusion". For one purpose it is this conclusion which is most important (p. 81-87). The first session of the synod was not the doctrinal debate demanded by the emperor, but a judicial action against Nestorius as a heretic. The inauguration of the Cyrillian synod as it was engineered went against the imperial instruction and was therefore irregular. When one tries to evaluate that decisive session two questions pose themselves:

- 1) Was the process against Nestorius equitable?
- 2) Where is the "dogma of Ephesus"? (p. 82).

Today one has to find an answer to these questions in the spirit of Vatican II. Christians will have to purify their memory of the faults of the past so as to overcome them. To try to deny incontestable historical truths in the name of faith is a sign of badly understood faith and leads to bad apologetics (n. 178 on p. 83). Nestorius in his Apology complained that without bishop John of Antioch and his suffragans the Cyrillian synod was only a particular and partisan synod; the bishop of Alexandria was judge and interested party as well; the judgement was passed without the presence of the accused. The imperial commissioner himself told the Oriental bishops that the decision had been reached without any examination or investigation and contrary to the imperial instruction. But not very much later it was punishable to say this and the 5th ecumenical council condemned everybody who still kept to this opinion (p. 83).

Today nobody can detect in the literary relicts of Nestorius the gross adoptionism which Cyril attributed to him and which the victim always repudiated. Concerning the title Theotokos we have to take note of the fact that Nestorius accepted it in his cathedral homily of Dec. 7, 430; that it was taken up in the symbolum unionis of 433 which was accepted in its turn by Cyril (p. 84). De Halleux speaks twice of the "orthodoxie foncière" of Nestorius, meaning that he is basically orthodox. Having established that, one should be in a better position to say what the "dogma of Ephesus" consists of (p. 85). Roman catholic theologians located it in the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius, condensing its content in the catchwords "Theotokos" and "hypostatic union". This is also what tradition kept as doctrinal result of the third ecumenical council. Cyril explained to adversaries and followers alike that "hypostatic" or "natural union" is nothing else than a "true" union. Therefore the "dogma of Ephesus" does not exclude the legitimacy of the Antiochene approach to the mystery of distinction in unity. And that is expressed in the symbolum unionis of 433 which can be considered to be the true doctrinal conclusion of the Ephesenan council. Nestorius could have signed that symbol. We should therefore undertake a *rélecture* of the Ephesenan judgement on Nestorius in the light of the symbolum unionis and in an ecumenical spirit. In recognizing the basic orthodoxy of Nestorius we of course do not overlook the weakness of his explanation of the unity of Christ's person.

The second paper of de Halleux, printed in *Irénikon* 1993 in two sections, is much shorter but treats the doctrinal side of the question in the same measure as the procedural. The opinions of de Halleux appear in even sharper relief than before. He considers the judicial action against Nestorius contestable (p. 40), the inauguration

of the synod illegal, there is indeed no other ecumenical council that began its [62] proceedings by defying imperial instructions (p. 41). Though the ecclesiastical tribunal sought to compensate the juridical irregularity of its meeting by strict observation of the forms of procedure, it nevertheless acted against an elementary rule of natural right, by having the accuser as judge (p. 41). It is not certain whether the excerpts from Nestorius which now figure in the acts were read at all at the synod, in any case they were not discussed. If the theological expressions used by the author of the excerpts is sometimes disagreeably provoking, they nevertheless correspond to Antiochene christology which in its turn is not incompatible with the patristic florilegium included in the acts. - The accused is *deposed*, which is much more severe than to be excommunicated (p. 44). Nowhere his "heresy" is put in precise terms, it is stated simply that he uttered blasphemies against Christ (p. 45). De Halleux then recounts the events after the arrival of John of Antioch at Ephesus: his own synod, and how the case of Nestorius was lost by the Orientals, not without help of enormous bribes from Alexandria distributed at Constantinople; how the Orientals were forced to assent to the condemnation of Nestorius's doctrine, the persecution of those who refused to do this. One has to acknowledge the disinterested attitude of Nestorius during all these troubles, in spite of the even harder places of exile he was brought to in Egypt, where he lived until 450 (p. 45-50).

Concerning the doctrine of Nestorius: his answer to the second letter of Cyril was judged in Ephesus to be in opposition to the faith of Nicaea, but it gives a philologically correct, Antiochene interpretation of the second article of the Nicaene creed. The disturbing expressions from his excerpts have to be read against the background of pre-Chalcedonian Antiochene christology with its strong anti-Apollinarian impetus (p. 163 f.). What about the opposition of Nestorius against the title Theotokos? This "bugbear" (as the church historian Socrates called it, h.e. 7,32) has to be reduced to his just proportions. The title was far from being in universal usage and had to be explained to the Occident after Ephesus. In Cyril's large œuvre it practically does not appear before 428, while it can be found in one of the homilies which Nau printed (in the Appendix to his translation of the Lib. Her.). Even at the height of the controversy Cyril is not constant in applying the title to Mary and he can call her the "holy Virgin" without further attributes. Nestorius opposed an "Apollinarian" interpretation of Theotokos, but he took up the expression in a sermon (of 430, mentioned already above) (p. 165). It is *not* the teaching of Nestorius that Jesus was *constituted* divine Son of God by his merits. Like all Antiochene theologians Nestorius refuses to let "ascend the properties of the flesh into the essence of God". The humanity of the Word incarnate, its consubstantiality with us is taken very seriously by Nestorius. According to him, one may not say that the Word "became" flesh, "becoming" is interpreted as "inhabitation" and as "taking on the form of a servant". To use "to become" for the Logos entrains mutability and that had been condemned by the Nicaene creed. Nestorius also uses the language of clothing - de Halleux refers at this point to the "venerable Syriac tradition" in the use of the metaphor (p. 166), but I may also add that Alexander

of Alexandria, the predecessor of Athanasius, employs this language. De Halleux regrets that Cyril by his restrictions has impoverished the christological heritage of the church universal. "In spite of all his glory, the Alexandrian christology represents a partial approach only to the mystery of incarnation. One should avoid to confuse Alexandrian particularities with the Apostolic tradition as such" - for the Antiochene tradition [63] preserves other and authentic aspects of that tradition. Also regrettable is Cyril's suspicion concerning the term *synapheia*, "conjunction", which he misunderstood (intentionally) as simple moral union. Here I want to point out that *synapheia* is used by the Antiochenes in the sense of "unconfused union" (*asynchytos henosis*), and that *asynchytos henosis* since its introduction into trinitarian and christological language belongs to the realm of the divine, is *nothing* less than a physical union and certainly not a mere moral union, but a supernatural union in the strictest sense. - De Halleux then mentions, as did Grillmeier, the passages where the thought of Nestorius could have been expressed by the term *perichoresis* (p. 167). Therefore de Halleux repeats his claim that Nestorius is basically orthodox in his intentions (p. 168). The next chapter is called by de Halleux "une christologie insatisfaisante" (p. 169-174) - since by now we know all about this, I will take up only some of the author's remarks, such as: "Let us avoid the condemnation of 'the' dualism of hypostases, which is at first sight unacceptable for any Cyrillian, be he a Chalcedonian or a non-Chalcedonian", for one has to remember that the concept of hypostasis (in its christological use) was not defined before the 6th century, and even then not in the same way by all (p. 171). Understood in the sense of Nestorius, hypostasis as objective and individual nature can be applied to Christ's manhood in a completely orthodox sense (p. 172). The great question is of course the "prosopon of union". De Halleux does not see it as deprived of *all* ontological consistence, but "at least of its signification of ultimate ontological principle", that is of "person" in the modern sense. Nestorius, though at fond an orthodox believer, was not a good theologian. He brought a defect of Antiochene christology to its extreme expression (p. 173). But Antiochene christology has an irreplaceable function: to remind us that the Christian paradox of God who is born, suffers and dies, cannot compromise the immutability and impassibility of the divine nature nor mutilate the *humanitas assumpta* in the exercise of its activity and its own will (p. 174).

Concluding with "Une perspective pour le dialogue" (p. 174-177), de Halleux emphasizes that the Assyrian church of the East professes through the formulas of her own tradition the common faith in the unconfused unity of Christ. In the creeds and theological statements of the patriarchal synods of this church, the specifics of the Liber Heraclidis, that is to say: the exchange of *prosopa* and the one common *prosopon*, do not appear. The greatest of her theologians, though, use these expressions (because they are the most educated among the clergy, we may add - the Liber Heraclidis does not make easy reading).

The perspective for the near future as seen by de Halleux, looks like this: After clearing up the misunderstandings in matters of terminology, the Assyrian Church of

the East could agree to consider orthodox the Cyrillian and Chalcedonian formulas of the one hypostasis of the Word incarnate, situating the hypostasis on the ontological level of person. However, this church must not be asked by the other churches to receive the formulas mentioned into her own christology; at the same time, her own formula of two hypostases in Christ are to be understood in an entirely orthodox sense, given the different concept of hypostasis.

Each tradition has tried to express in ontological language something of the unfathomable mystery of union without separation and confusion. A common profession of faith, respectful of these traditions should content itself to be inspired by [64] the kerygmatic language of the Apostolic tradition, as it was condensed in the creed of Nicaea.

De Halleux's insights are of crucial importance for our consultations, for this reason I have referred to them at such length. But now of course the time and the space is lacking to do justice to Nestorianism in the same way.

In spite of this I want to begin with some remarks on the translation of Syriac christological terminology in the existing editions. Those who do not read old Syriac are of course obliged to rely on translations. Some of them give a quite misleading picture of Nestorian christology by translating *qenoma* as "person", "personne", so that the two *qenome*, the two hypostases of Christ, become two persons. This then leads to the further difficulty to find a fitting translation for *parzopa*, *prosopon*. To give some instances from the nineties of the last century to the eighties of ours: "personne" for *qenoma* is used by Martin in his edition and translation of Narsai's Homily on the three Nestorian teachers (1899/1900); Frederick McLeod in his edition and translation of a group of Narsai's Homilies on the Nativity, Epiphany, Passion etc. of Christ still does the same (Patr. Orient. 1979). But I hear that in the meantime he has seen the error of his ways. The great Chabot in his big volume containing the Synodicon Orientale (1902) appears to be not consistent in the way he renders *qenoma*; we find again and again "personne", though occasionally he says hypostasis. To my amazement Robert Hespel and the venerable Draguet still kept to "personne" for *qenoma* in their translation of the Scholia of Theodore bar Konai, the text of which had been edited by Addai Scher long ago. Hespel and Draguet then proceed to give *parzopa* as "person-nage" with sometimes unhappy results (CSCO 1981/2).

Antiochene christology and exegesis reached the Christian church in Persia in full force by Narsai, formerly director of the School of Edessa and then in the same position at the School of Nisibis, where also other teachers assembled after the closure of the Edessene academy. A great difficulty is the fixation of the date of Narsai's expulsion from Edessa, see the discussion in the Leiden thesis by Judith Frishman, "The Ways and Means of Divine Economy", of 1992 (p. 1-6 of the third part). Frishman here edits and translates a group of six homilies of Narsai. Narsai's arrival at Nisibis belongs to the second half of the 5th century (471 probably); but he did *not* bring with him the Liber Heraclidis, he did not even know that book. It was in the first half of the 6th century that the Liber Heraclidis came to Persia: Mar Aba, later Catholicos,

brought a Greek copy from the West, from Constantinople, I believe. It was translated in 539/40 and gave to the dyophysite church there a second injection of Antiochene christology, in a very special form. The most effective use of it was made by Babai the Great (d. 628) in his book "On the divinity and the humanity and on the prosopon of union", better known under his shorter title as *De unione*. The "Great Monastery" of Abraham of Kashkar evidently had a copy of the translated *Liber Heraclidis*, for we know of Bar 'Edta from this monastery, who learned the book by heart (really all of it?) before 561. Babai the Great himself was abbot of the Great Monastery and indeed addressed the *Liber de Unione* to the brethren there. This work shows him to be the best dogmatician of his church; a remarkable trait of it is the subtle reinterpretation of some *topoi* central to Theodore of Mopsuestia. On the other hand he takes over the two *qenome* and the complicated doctrine of the different kinds of *prosopa* from the *Liber Heraclidis*, which result in [65] the one *prosopon* of union, cp. the original title of *De unione* just quoted. It is his influence which altered with the document of 612 the character of the synodal statements of the Persian church, until his time of cautious expression, sometimes very near the Chalcedonian formula, sometimes insisting on adherence to the heritage of Theodore. There is a paper by Sebastian Brock in a *Festschrift* of 1985 describing and translating into English the material from the *Synodicon Orientale*. The document of 612 made two *qenome* in the one Christ the official teaching of the Church of the East. The reasons for this more radical expression of the christological dogma were the presence of a second ecclesiastical organization in Persia, of Severian persuasion, and a branch of neo-Chalcedonianism in the dyophysite church itself teaching one composite *qenoma* of Christ, thus taking up the *hypostasis synthetos* from the West. In the person of Henana it dominated the School of Nisibis for several decades. A handbook like the "Nestorian collection of christological texts", published by A. E. Goodman and me in 1972 is intended as a statement of Nestorian orthodoxy in view of these divergent christologies.

If we look back from 612 to Narsai we find in his homilies also a clear doctrine of two natures, two *qenome* and one *prosopon* in Christ. As in Nestorius, the distinction of *two* hypostases by Narsai was certainly a reaction to Cyril's one christological hypostasis as taught in a special provoking manner in the twelve anathemata.

It is our task now to overcome the old misunderstandings and the hostile insinuations on both sides. The rich heritage of the Church of the East should be preserved by the efforts of us all.

5.4 The faith in Christ of the councils

1 The four ecumenical councils

The four councils are the synods of 325 in Nicaea, 381 in Constantinople, 431 in Ephesus and 451 in Chalcedon, which are referred to as "ecumenical". The meaning of the adjective "ecumenical" has changed over the centuries. Back then, the synods were called "ecumenical" because the emperor convened them for the imperial territory or for his half of the empire. For Romans and Greeks, the Roman Empire largely coincided with the world they knew, which was called *oikoumene*. In the course of time, a different meaning of "ecumenical" has developed when speaking of "ecumenical synods": these are those that are binding for the whole church. All four synods mentioned were convened by the emperor: Constantine the Great, Theodosius the Great, Theodosius the Second and Marcian, whom the sister of the second Theodosius, Princess Pulcheria, had married. With the exception of Ephesus in 431, the other three synods met, if not in Constantinople itself, then at least in the immediate vicinity of the eastern capital of the Roman Empire, in Nicaea in Bithynia in 325 and in Chalcedon in 451, so that the emperors could always exercise control over these synods if they so wished. As far as we know anything about the proceedings of the Synod of Nicaea - and unfortunately that is very little - Emperor Constantine took part in the debates there. In 451, Emperor Marcian influenced the formation of the confession through the senators leading the council. Without the emperor's pressure, the Chalcedonense would not have come about in the form we have today. We would also like to know more about the Synod of 381 than is the case; but we are all the better informed about Ephesus 431, a most unpleasant event, and Chalcedon 451. This is because we have large collections of documents relating to these two synods of the 5th century and the protocols intended for publication at the time. All these texts have been masterfully edited by Eduard Schwartz¹. This makes older editions, Mansi² in particular, obsolete. Nothing comparable has survived for the two older synods, so that some uncertainties remain and in some things one cannot go beyond hypotheses.

The documents in which the four councils laid down their belief in Christ are the result of the most intense theological disputes, including between church parties or groups of theologians who contributed to the positive outcome. These documents seek to fend off, delimit, exclude, defi

Note: [The endnotes of the original have been converted into footnotes - *ed.*]

¹ E. Schwartz (ed.), *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Strasbourg 1914 ff.

² G. D. Mansi (ed.), *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Florence/Venice 1759-98.

and, under certain circumstances, bring about a balance. Therefore, it was necessary to be specific, differentiated, but also combined. The mere repetition of the old, even if it was always referred to, was not sufficient for new questions. This explains the use of a vocabulary that was and still is repeatedly perceived and criticized as unbiblical, namely *ousia* ("essence"), *physis* ("nature"), *hypostasis* (practically untranslatable, best adopted as "hypostasis"), *prosopon* ("person"), and in the Chalcedonense the four well-known negative adverbs, whose key word is *asynchytos* ("unmixed"). Quite literally, *asynchytos* means "not mixed together"; because there are several expressions for 'mix' in Greek, it is useful to be precise when translating. A. v. Harnack made derisive and disparaging remarks about these four negative ad[239]verbs.³ Researching the background of such vocabulary and thus arriving at a better understanding⁴ is part of historical work, which is also indispensable in theology.

At the four ecumenical synods the Trinitarian and then also the Christological problem is dealt with. Even if in both cases it is a question of the Son of God, it is useful to distinguish between the two problems, simply in order to speak a little more precisely theologically. *Distinguere est intellegere*, said scholasticism, "to distinguish is to understand". The Trinitarian problem is about the relationship of the Son of God to his Father and later also about the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son. The Christological dispute concerns the relationship between the human and the divine in Christ himself.

2 Presentation of the Council texts

To illustrate this, I have selected four texts and translated them:

Text I is the Niceneum of 325, divided into four sections, section II is subdivided into a) and b). For a more detailed discussion, I have also counted the lines in II. a), b).

Text II does not offer the Niceno-Constantinopolitanum (hereafter = C), but a precisely formulated theological definition. This definition dates from the year 382, when they also met in Constantinople, and is, as the synodal members themselves say, a short form of what had already been formulated in Antioch in 379 and repeated in Constantinople in 381. Thus, while the coherence of the presentation of this short form and the ecumenical council of 381 is attested to us by the participants themselves, [240] the nature of the connection between C and the council is much less clear.

³ A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* II (4th ed.), Tübingen 1909, 397 f.

⁴ For the chalcedonian "unmixed" see. L. Abramowski, *Συνάφεια* and *ἀσυγχύτος* ἔνωσις as Bezeichnung für trinitarische und christologische Einheit, in: dieselbe, *Drei christologische Untersuchungen* (BZNW 45), Berlin 1981, 63-109.

more difficult to determine. It was not until 451 that this confession was said to have been drawn up by the 150 fathers under the great Theodosius in Constantinople. The origin of C has often been discussed. The two most recent hypotheses come from Adolf Martin Ritter, who wrote a book on the Council of Constantinople⁵, and from myself.⁶

If one follows my hypothesis, it is easier to understand why in C, which is familiar to us as a confession of the Mass, the actually expected termini of the newly formed Nicene doctrine of the Trinity do not occur. Neither is there any mention of the "The Holy Spirit is said to be "equal in essence" to the Father and the Son. We have therefore always had to make an effort to read these expressions and what they mean into the text. In my opinion, which is based on the combination of various statements on the Greek and Roman side that have not yet received sufficient attention, C goes back to a text that originated in Rome. As we know from one source, a synod of Western bishops met in Rome, who added statements about the Holy Spirit to the Niceneum of 325 and sent this text (which I refer to as the Niceneo-Romanum) to the East, where it was accepted by a synod there. This eastern synod was a large assembly held in Antioch in 379. In my opinion, C is the confirmatory return of the Niceneo-Romanum to Rome; such a return had been requested by the Romans. The text of the Niceneo-Romanum must have undergone some editing on this occasion. The Roman origin of the basic text of C would explain why we not only hear nothing of the Nicene distinction between *ousia* and *hypostasis* [241], but also why these terms do not appear in C at all. The Latin West had great difficulty with *hypostasis*. Furthermore, a Roman original form of C would explain those lines of text in C that correspond to the Romanum and thus to the later Apostolicum: the statements about the birth of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary and the crucifixion under Pontius Pilate, which are not found in the old Nicene.

The resulting surprising connections from C to Rome should have an effect on the conversation with the Orthodox Church. The conversation repeatedly stumbles over the later Latin addition of the "filioque" in C; indeed, one can almost speak of a poisoning of the atmosphere by the "filioque". But if C has a Roman origin, things look somewhat different, even if this fact was once forgotten in Rome. C must be included with the entire file material of 379 in Constantinople in the files of the ecumenical synod of 381

⁵ A. M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol*, Göttingen 1965.

⁶ L. Abramowski, *What does the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum (C) have to do with the Council of Constantinople?*
381? in: THPh 67 (1992) 481-513 [here in this volume pp. 331-362 - *the editor*].

would have been incorporated. In Constantinople, C was in ecclesiastical use, as we see from Nestorius, bishop of the capital from 428 to 431. C, as we know it, is in form a pure baptismal confession, without particularly difficult definitions beyond the Nicene. This explains its great liturgical success. It was actually used as a baptismal symbol in the East, became a Eucharistic symbol when this liturgical innovation was introduced and came to the West under Emperor Justinian. However, as already mentioned, the great career of C did not begin in 381, but with Chalcedon. The doctrinal letter of Chalcedon first quotes the old Niceneum and then C, among other things as justification for presenting its own Christological definition. Such a justification was necessary because of all those who held the view that the Niceneum was sufficient and that no new confessional formulations were needed. Such a view could be countered with C [242] as a Niceneum that had already been expanded due to the controversial Trinitarian position of the Spirit. The doctrinal opinion of the second ecumenical council is thus available to us in the abridged version of 382 (Text II). The more precise theological provisions that are missing in C can be found here. But no one would think of using this text liturgically.

Text III is not a text from the Cyrillic Synod of Ephesus in 431 - the synod that the Cyrillians understood to be the only assembly that could be considered legitimate. What Text III contains is the confession of union between the Antiochians and Cyril of Alexandria from 433. A. Grillmeier⁷ and the recently deceased church historian, orientalist and patristic scholar A. de Halleux⁸ are of the opinion, with which I agree, that it is this confession that is to be regarded as the conclusion of the Ephesian Council of 431. The text is also interesting because it was obviously consulted in Chalcedon. Just as Text II was an interpretation of the Nicene Creed (I have summarized this in a short introductory formula), Text III, which is the core of a longer letter, is also preceded by an appeal to the Nicene Creed. What is meant, of course, is always the formula of 325. The Niceneum is also to be "confirmed" in 433 (in Denzinger-Hünemann, *plerophoria* is translated as "complete declaration", but this does not fit the "brevity" in which the authors want to speak; in [canonical] legal texts, *plerophorein* means "to confirm").

Text IV is the Christological core of the Chalcedonian Tomus (*tomos* = doctrinal writing). As already mentioned, the Christological definition is preceded by both the Nicene and now also by C. Before going into further details, a theological-historical and problem-historical introduction is necessary for theological understanding.

⁷ A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche I* (3rd ed.), Freiburg etc. 1990, 687.

⁸ A. de Halleux, *La première session du concile d'Éphèse (29 juin 431)*, in: ETL 69 (1993) 86.

[243] 3 The theological problem

The confession of Jesus, the Christ, as the Son of God could be interpreted in different ways. One main line of theological development - in fact there are several - emphasizes the divinity of the one who is placed in relation to God as the Son. This gave rise early on to the danger that the human Jesus would disappear into or behind the divine Jesus Christ. This is why in the prologue to John, of all places, which speaks of the Only Begotten as the pre-existent Logos, the Word, who is himself *theos*, God, with the Father, we have the statement that the Logos became flesh (John 1:14), a statement that was blatant to ancient ears. Just how blatant becomes clear from the fact that *sarx* in Paul has the meaning of "flesh of sin". The letters of John not only make the confession of Jesus as Christ (I John 2:22, cf. 5:1) and as the Son of God (I John 4:15, cf. 5:5) the criterion of truth and error, but the discernment of spirits also takes place in the confession of Jesus Christ who came in the flesh (I John 4:2 f.; 2 John 7). Whoever does not want to say this is not of God, says the author, "dissolves Jesus" (*lyei ton Iesoun*), as the reading of I John 4:3 preferred by Hans von Campenhausen⁹ says. Von Campenhausen does not understand this reading in the sense of the not incorrect, but trivializing paraphrase offered by the Bauersche Wörterbuch zum NT, 3rd edition 1937: "lyein" in this passage means "to invalidate the correct teaching of Jesus through rejection", as opposed to confessing (homologeîn). Aland's new edition of the dictionary (6th edition 1988) dispenses with a translation of the reading.

The emphasis on the divinity or deity of Christ therefore makes the adherence to The Gospel of John, in its full earthly humanity, indeed in its "flesh" (*sarx*), was given a special task early on; Christology is added to soteriology. If we consider that [244] the Epistles of John are somewhat younger than the Gospel, then we find ourselves with them at the beginning of the second century. But the emphasis on Christ's *sarx* in the fourth century in Apollinarius will lead to the paradoxical result that everything else about Christ's human nature, namely his spiritual and mental powers, is deified, the "man" is distinguished from his *sarx*. Interestingly, decades before Apollinarius, the Nicene already used the phrase "incarnate" (*sarkothenta*) alongside "incarnate" (*enanthrope- santa*).

However, the emphasis on the divinity or deity of Christ gave rise to a further theological challenge. How could the confession of Christ as the God-like one (Phil 2:6) to the Logos, who is God (John 1:1), be reconciled with the Old Testament commandment of monotheism, the worship of the one God? Certainly, Old Testament predicates of God, such as *kyrios*, Lord, were applied to Jesus.

⁹ H. von Campenhausen, Das Bekenntnis im Urchristentum, in: Urchristliches und Altkirchliches, Tübingen 1979, 249-253 on the 1st Epistle of John, 251 note 153 on the textual variant.

bear. This is particularly the case with Paul, who distinguishes the *kyrios* Jesus Christ from *ho theos pater*, from God the Father (even if he sometimes also calls the Father *kyrios*). Is this distinction the Pauline solution to the monotheistic problem (which would argue for a Pauline subordination of the *kyrios* to God the Father)¹⁰ or does Paul not yet perceive this problem as burning?

It was not only the adoption of the OT by Christians that made attention to the monotheistic problem a permanent task, but of course also the polemic against Greek and Roman polytheism resulting from monotheism. As the religious driving force behind the Trinitarian debate, the monotheistic question cannot be overestimated. It is by no means just a dispute about words or even letters, as in the often mocked difference between *homoousious* and *homoiousios* during a relatively short phase of the Arian [245] controversy, where the difference consists only in an *iota*, the smallest Greek letter. It is rather a problem of the greatest theoretical-theological and practical-catechetical importance. The Nicene solution to the Trinitarian question, where three hypostases of equal rank are distinguished in the one divine being, did not eliminate the monotheistic problem, but rather conjured up the danger of a doctrine of three independent gods¹¹, which is why one of the three great Cappadocians wrote a treatise "Quod non sint tres dii", "that there are not three gods"; a treatise whose argumentation could have been more convincing.

As early as the second century, we find two opposing solutions for the relationship of the divine Son to the Father in the context of the monotheistic problem: on the one hand, the clear subordination of the Son to the Father and, on the other, the identification of Son and Father. With the identification theory, the Christological problem immediately arises again, as Tertullian saw: if the divine Son is the Father, or the Father is the Son - what then happens to the man Jesus? This question will reappear in a varied form in the fourth century. Identification theology occupied the most important theologians for well over a hundred years (Justin, Tertullian, Novatian, Origen and Dionys of Alexandria). It is no coincidence that all of them are logo-theologians - different enough among themselves - and all of them advocate the subordination of the Son to the Father in different variations. Origen is the first to describe the distinction between Father, Son and Spirit as that of hypostases. The theology of identification does not seem to have survived these attacks, but it is, so to speak, a ghost in the fourth century.

¹⁰ This would fit very well with 1 Cor 15:24-29, where "submission" is explicitly mentioned for "the end".

¹¹ It is therefore necessary to define the special unity of the three hypostases in the an *ousia*, see below 262 [here in this volume p. 391].

under the name of Sabellianism or Patripassia[246]nism against those theologians who seem to overemphasize the unity of the Trinitarian God. Marcell of Ankyra must repeatedly defend himself against such accusations. The best refutation of identification theology that I know of is the one by Tertullian (he fights people who advocate the unity of God with the keyword *monarchia*, "one reign"). I have already pointed out that Tertullian sees the systematic connection between the doctrine of the Trinity and Christology. He solves the problem posed by the Monarchians by means of the topics of *asynchytos henosis* and *synapheia* (Latin *unio non confusa* and *coniunctio*), i.e. "unmixed unity". With the exception of echoes in Novatian, he initially finds no successor.

In contrast, the blatant differentiations between father and son, which Bishop Dionys of Alexandria put forward against the "Sabellians" in Libya, had an almost explosive effect. This Dionys was so important and famous that Euseb of Caesarea dedicated an entire book to him in his church history. Of Dionys' statements on the Trinitarian question, however, only a short quotation in an Arian florilege and key words in the documents of the so-called Dionysian controversy have survived - this seems to me to be no coincidence. As far as the controversy of the two Dionysians is concerned, I have shown that its documents are only a product of the fourth century¹², prompted precisely by the key words mentioned, which caused the Nicene scholars, especially Athanasius, the greatest difficulties. It must be remembered that Athanasius, as Bishop of Alexandria, was in the succession of the great Dionys. The Arians were naturally delighted to invoke this former bishop of Alexandria against their great enemy Athanasius. Incidentally, the search for a theological ancestor of Arius, which has occupied researchers [247] up to recent times, can be satisfactorily answered by referring to this great authority of the third century. Dionys said that the Father "made" the Son; *poiein*, "to make", is found in the Septuagint of Gen 1:1 instead of the expected *ktizein*, "to create". Because the Father made the Son, i.e. created him, the Father could not be the Son. Dionys compared the relationship between Father and Son with that of the vine grower and the vine, for which he presumably referred to the speeches of the Johannine Jesus (John 15:1); the comparison with the shipbuilder and the ship was even more offensive.

However, the Arians judged these statements from a different perspective: they evaluate for the succession of Father and Son. The Father, they say, is before the Son, the Son is after him and therefore distinct from him and subordinate to him. According to ancient teaching, the older is always better than the younger. Arius

¹² L. Abramowski, Dionys of Rome († 268) and Dionys of Alexandria († 264/5) in the Arian disputes of the 4th century, in: ZKG 93 (1982) 240-272 [English version in L. Abramowski, *Formula and Context. Studies in Early Christian Thought*, Variorum, Hampshire 1992, no. XI, pp. 1-35 - *the editor*].

and his bishop Alexander, the predecessor of Athanasius, argued with each other within the paradigm of a clear distinction between Father, Son and Spirit; for both theologians, the Son had a hypostasis of his own. Arius, however, accuses the bishop of elevating the Son next to the Father in such a way that the Son also becomes an "unbegotten" (like the Father). Here, in Arius' objection to his bishop's teaching, is in my opinion the starting point for the dispute that pervades almost the entire fourth century. Arius and the bishops who took his side when the dispute was carried out of Alexandria concluded that Alexander was teaching two "ungenerated principles" (*archai*), which would of course contradict the doctrine of one God. Alexander always rightly rejected this accusation. For him, too, the uniqueness of the Father in relation to the Son consists in the fact that he is unbegotten. One has [248] the impression that Alexander already distinguishes "to become" from "to be begotten/born". Some forms of these Greek verbs sounded the same, so that both spelling and meaning were confused - after all, to be born is also to become. Arius had probably not yet made this distinction. His friends then also drew arguments against the later Nicene philosophers from the "not-becoming" *and* the "begotten-becoming" of the Son, but with a distinction between the verbs. In fact, however, the problem is not only known from the debate in Alexandria: As early as the middle of the third century, Novatian teaches that one cannot speak of two "unborn" (*innati*) may speak in God.¹³

Arius used Proverbs 8 against Alexander, where Wisdom (in the Greek version) says of herself: "The Lord *created* me as the beginning of his ways"; a few lines further on she says that the Lord *begat* her.¹⁴ The correct interpretation of Prov 8:22-31 was the subject of many efforts during the Trinitarian controversy. Wisdom (*sophia*) and Logos had long been identified, namely in the Sapientia Salomonis, the latest writing of the Greek Old Testament; most New Testament writings presuppose this identification. Incidentally, it must be made clear that for Arius, too, the Son of God is not merely a creature, but also God, *theos*. One misunderstands him and his followers if one thinks that they only reduce the Son to the level of creation. For them, the Son is God as both born and created by God, and both in an extraordinary way that no one else can match. The bishops outside Egypt who supported Arius, including Euseb of Caesarea, then said, among other things, that the Son was God himself, but not *true* God.¹⁵ Before we become indignant about this, we must remember John 17:3 [249] (from the high

¹³ Novatian, De trinitate XXXI 188.

¹⁴ Interestingly, this verb is in the present tense, while for the creation statement in verse 22 a past tense is used.

¹⁵ H. G. Opitz (ed.), Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites 318-328 (Athanasius, Werke III 1), Berlin/Leipzig 1934, 5,7 f. (Urk. 3).

priestly prayer of Jesus), where the Johannine Jesus says: "But this is eternal life, that they may know you, the only true (*alethinon*) God, and whom you have sent, Jesus Christ." One of the difficulties of the dispute was that both sides could cite biblical quotations to support their view. Elsewhere, Arius states that the Son was "created by the will of God before the ages and the eons" ¹⁶, and the other Euseb, Bishop of Nicomedia and leader of the Origenists, refuses to say that the Son is "from the essence of the Father" ¹⁷ - which brings us to what is probably the most important keyword of the Niceneum of 325. The dispute had therefore come to a head over how to understand the origin of the Son from the Father. Nothing was found about this in the Prologue to John; this is the reason why the OT was searched for texts that could help. The Prologue of John only says "in the beginning was the Logos". Although the passage from Prov 8 (LXX) provided information about the origin of wisdom, it was ambiguous, especially if the decisive verbs were taken literally. Thus, at this stage of the debate, the proverbial text was more of an additional embarrassment and likely to exacerbate the dispute.

[250] Text I: Nicaea 325

(Denziger/Hünemann No. 125, 126)

- | | |
|----------|---|
| I | Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν,
πατέρα παντοκράτορα,
πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀορατῶν ποιητήν, |
| 1 IIa | καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, |
| 2 | τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, |
| 3 | γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μονογενῆ, |
| 4 | τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, |
| 5 | Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, |
| 6 | φῶς ἐκ φωτός, |
| 7 | Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, |
| 8 | γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, |
| 9 | ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί, |
| 10 | δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, |
| 11 | τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ, |
| 12 IIb | τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους |
| 13 | καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα |
| 14 | καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, |
| 15 | παθόντα |
| 16 | καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, |

¹⁶ Ibid. 13,4 (Urk. 6).

¹⁷ Ibid. 16,3 (Urk. 8).

- 17 ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς,
 18 ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,
 III καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα.
 IV Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας- "ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν", καὶ "πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν", καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι ἢ κτιστὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

[251] Translation I*

- I We believe in one God
 the Father Almighty
 Creator of all things visible and invisible
 1 IIa and in one Lord Jesus Christ,
 2 the Son of God
 3 natives conceived from the father,
 4 i.e. from the nature of the father,
 5 God from God,
 6 Light from light,
 7 true God from true God,
 8 begotten, not created,
 9 the same nature as the father;
 10 through which everything became:
 11 the one in heaven and the one on earth;
 12 IIb because of us humans
 13 and descended because of our salvation,
 14 Incarnate, made man,
 15 who have suffered
 16 and resurrected on the third day,
 17 ascended into the heavens,
 18 (to judge the living and the dead,
 III and to the Holy Spirit.
 IV But those who say: "once upon a time he was not"; and: "before he was begotten he was not", and that he became from the non-existent; or who say that the Son of God is from another hypostasis or entity or created or transformed or changed, these the Catholic Church anathematizes.

* In the second article translated extremely literally in order to retain the continuous accusative construction of the original.

[252] After this long approach, we can now turn to the Confession of the Synod of Nicaea 325 (Text I). We are particularly interested in Art. IIa and therein lines 3-9 as well as the Anathemata (IV). These sections reflect the contemporary debate. It is also necessary to take a look at the form of the symbol, which is not without its peculiarities. We note that, apart from the sentences of condemnation at the end, the form of a tripartite and trinitarian - tripartite in itself is not necessarily trinitarian (see Text III below!) - declaratory confession was chosen. Declaratory means that it is spoken in the first person singularis or pluralis. Of course, Article III is reduced to the mere mention of the Holy Spirit. Incidentally, this is no different in the Apostolicum. However, Article III of the Niceneum also lacks the other key words: Church, forgiveness of sins, resurrection, which can certainly be found in the Romanum/Apostolicum. Now Euseb of Caesarea presented a confession at the Synod of 325 to prove his orthodoxy, declaratory and Trinitarian in form, in which the third article was just as short. Euseb claimed that his confession had been taken as the basis of the Nicene Creed, albeit, as he must admit, with decisive and drastic theological corrections that he had to swallow hard. And of course his confession did not contain the Anathemata (Section IV of the Niceneum). Euseb's confession is not the baptismal confession of the Church of Caesarea, as older scholars assumed, but it does take the *form* of a baptismal confession. This is not unimportant for the history of symbols, after the interventions made by Hans von Campenhausen, because Euseb's symbol already proves the existence and familiarity of the typical de[253]claratory, Trinitarian form of the baptismal confession for this time.

That the Nicene Creed itself was not intended for liturgical use can be seen from Article IIa, line 4, which is a more precise explanation of *ek tou patros*, "from the Father". A sentence that begins with "that is" cannot be used in a baptismal confession. This line also interrupts the continuous accusative construction of the second article, which I point out in my translation. Formally disturbing, this explanatory line is the most important of the positive statements in Article IIa *in terms of content*. It remains so for a long time, because initially the core statement was not *homoousion*, but *ek tes ousias patros*, "from the essence of the Father". The Arian discourses of Athanasius, which he wrote between 339 and 342, bear witness to this. But even apart from the defining insertion of line 4, the structure of lines 3 to 9 is not the best. Line 3 is taken up again in line 8 - the key word "begotten" is now defined negatively; it is said what is not to be understood by it. Line 5 is also taken up again in line 7 for clarification. After the prehistory of the Council, which I have indicated, one can recognize against whom these statements are specifically directed. The way Article IIa now stands, it was certainly not written down in one go, but rather the decisive

I tinkered with the Eusebian template by omitting and adding.

In C, most of this formal disorder has been removed; in a sense, it has been tidied up. The explanatory colon "that is" is missing and, interestingly, so is the phrase "from the essence of the Father". Likewise, the Nicene "God from God" (because it is contained in "true God from true God") is missing in C, but in its Latin version it has re-entered from the old Nicene [254], so that if one speaks C, *the* ecumenical confession par excellence, together with Orthodox Christians, one is already out of step at this point. But the twofold *gennethenta*, "begotten", is retained in C. And of course *homoousion to patri*, "coessential with the Father". Obviously "from the essence of the father" was seen as contained in *homoousion*. *Homoousion* had only gradually come to the fore as the Nicene key word, having hardly played a role in the decades immediately following 325. It was only in the late 1950s that it was drawn out and filled with content, which can again be seen in the writings of Athanasius.

Now to the *homoousios* itself (line 9). Where does the word come from? Astonishingly, we have to realize that it was apparently Arius who threw the word *homoousios* into the debate in a confession of faith addressed to his bishop, which was signed by fifteen Alexandrian, Egyptian and Libyan deacons, presbyters and bishops. One should not refer to the Son as the "begotten of the Father", for then he would be a *meros homoousion*, an "equally essential part", and that would be Manichaeism¹⁸, i.e. heretical. It was the general, also philosophical, conception of deity that one should not speak of it as if it had "parts", as this would have contradicted the divine "simplicity", *haplotes*. The Gnostic use of *meros homoousion* for the divine pneuma *part* in man is actually attested to us as early as 200 in Alexandria by Clement of Alexandria. In Tertullian, i.e. at about the same time in Latin Africa, we find *consubstantivus*, and this, mind you, as a reference to Gnostic doctrine. From the scattered reports from the fourth century about the events in Nicaea, the most plausible explanation for the insertion of *homoousion to patri* into the Confession, in view of the prehistory, seems to me to be what is found in Ambrose: the word was [255] inserted because it was seen to be repugnant to the followers of Arius. No wonder it took so long to come to a positive appreciation of the word. Of course, the participants in the synod, who were not friends of Arius, did not understand *homoousios* as an expression for the Son as a "part" of the Father. In the Nicene, however, the vocabulary should initially be seen as a reaction of defiance. In any case, Alexander of Alexandria and his confederates did not use the word before 325.

¹⁸ Ibid. 12,11 f (Urk. 3).

In connection with the positive appreciation of *homoousios*, which became necessary due to the fact of its inclusion in the Niceneum, a prehistory of the word was constructed, which should have already taken place in the ecclesiastical discussions of the third century. Both sides, the Nicene scholars as well as their opponents, bring such backward projections. Modern scholarship has of course also tried to find positive motives for the use of the keyword in the confession. Respectable authors for the insertion have been assumed, such as Emperor Constantine himself or the Spanish bishop Ossius, the emperor's confidant.

Article IIa of the Niceneum, with its ever-changing definitions of the Son as one born or begotten of the Father, thus takes up a position in the contemporary debate, whereby, for the purpose of clear demarcation, an expression was finally adopted which had been perhor- resced by the opponents and which, of course, had to be reinterpreted. As far as I can tell from Athanasius' later writings, *homoousios* was understood by him and probably also by others more as a designation of origin and not so much as an equivalent for the one *ousia* of Father and Son. The emphasis shifted to this latter understanding in the second half of the fourth century. Consequently, a definition of *homoousios* was not established first in order to [256] then include it in the confession, but the positive filling of the term only happened gradually. Incidentally, the same applies to *ousia* and *hypostasis*, which appear in the anathemata of the Niceneum. Here, the two terms are still used synonymously; they are only distinguished in the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity. Incidentally, we can see that *ousia*, *physis* and *hypostasis* have a concrete meaning in all the great theologians in the early period of the Arian controversy. This can be recognized by the fact that *pragma* (thing, reality) can stand in for *hypostasis*. This helps to understand this particularly abstract vocabulary and gives it a positive content. In the Christological debates of the sixth century, however, much more complicated definitions were arrived at.

These are the complications and backgrounds of Article IIa of the Nicene Creed. If we now look at Article IIb of the Confession, we get a completely different impression. Lines 12 and 13 set a strong soteriological accent, which was already present in Euseb's Confession (which is highly commendable), but is formulated even more extensively in the Nicene Creed. We find this soteriological sentence again in all the confessions or definitions that make up the texts selected here: For us and for our salvation the Son of God came down, became man, became flesh.

If one wishes, Article IIb of the Niceneum with its enumeration of the stations of Christ's way can be seen as narrative, to use this word once, as "narrative". It is repeatedly demanded that Christology, the doctrine of Christ as God and man, should be presented in a properly understood narrative way, taking up New Testament statements. In his recently published Christology, Peter Hünemann has pointed out that the Second Vatican Council did not fulfill this

demand [257] was followed. At the same time, Hünemann accuses the Council's statements of lacking any conceptual sharpness.¹⁹ It is obviously difficult to consider both points of view at the same time. In the course of the history of theology, the vocabulary of the doctrine of the Trinity and Christology, which I listed earlier, have become large definitional nests in the context of speculative systems, which has led to the understandable reaction that one must return to the biblical testimony and that Christology must be narrative, must tell of Christ's words and deeds and suffering for our salvation.

In fact, Article IIb of the Niceneum offers a very brief selection from the narrative material of the Gospels, that which was considered really important. And this *does not* include the birth of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary. Text II, the abridged version of the Tomus of Constantinople, also says nothing about the virgin birth.

[258] Text II: Constantinople 382

(Summary of the Tomus Antiochien 379 = Constantinople 381; from: Theodoret, h.e. [ed. Parmentier/Scheidweiler, GCS 44] V 9,11 f., 292,11-293,3; here in my arrangement and translation as ThPh 67 (1992) 1 f.).

(The Nicene faith teaches us)

- | | | |
|---|----|--|
| A | I | <p>a πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ
καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος,</p> <p>b δηλαδὴ θεότητος καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ οὐσίας μιᾶς τοῦ πατρὸς
καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος πιστευομένης,</p> <p>c ὁμοτιμοῦ τε τῆς ἀξίας καὶ συναϊδίου τῆς βασιλείας</p> |
| | II | <p>a ἐν τρισὶ τελειοτάτοις
ὑποστάσεσιν ἡγουν τρισὶ τελείοις
προσώποις,</p> <p>b1 ὥς μήτε τὴν Σαβελλίου νόσον χώραν λαβεῖν
συγχεομένων τῶν ὑποστάσεων
εἴτ' οὖν τῶν ιδιοτήτων ἀναιρουμένων,</p> <p>b2a μήτε μὴν τὴν Εὐνομιανῶν καὶ Ἀρειανῶν
καὶ Πνευματομάχων βλασφημίαν ἰσχύειν,
τῆς οὐσίας ἢ τῆς φύσεως [ἢ] τῆς θεότητος τευνομένης</p> <p>b2b καὶ τῇ ἀκτίστῳ καὶ ὁμοουσίῳ καὶ συναϊδίῳ τριάδι
μεταγενεστέρας τινὸς ἢ κτιστῆς
ἢ ἑτερουσίῳ φύσεως ἐπαγομένης.</p> |
| B | a | <p>καὶ τὸν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως δὲ τοῦ κυρίου
λόγον ἀδιάστροφον σώζομεν,</p> |

¹⁹ P. Hünemann, Jesus Christ. Gottes Wort in der Zeit, Münster 1994; on "the narrative Christology of Vatican II" and the lack of conceptual sharpness: 352-357.

- οὔτε ἄψυχον οὔτε ἄνουν ἢ ἀτελῇ
 τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς οἰκονομίαν παραδεχόμενοι,
 b ὅλον δὲ εἰδότες τέλειον μὲν πρὸ αἰώνων ὄντα θεὸν λόγον,
 τέλειον δὲ ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν
 διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν γενόμενον.

[259] Translation II

(The Nicene faith teaches us)

- A I a to believe in the name of the Father and of the Son
 and of the Holy Spirit,
 b in that clearly (δηλαδή) a deity and power and essence of the Father
 and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is believed,
 c equally honored in dignity and eternal in dominion
 II a in three completely perfect hypostases,
 that is, in three perfect persons,
 b1 so that neither the evil of Sabellius has place
 where the hypostases are heaped together nor
 the peculiarities are abolished,
 b2a nor have the blasphemy of the Eunomians and
 Arians and Pneumatomachs power, where the
 essence or nature of the Godhead is cut up
 b2b and to the uncreated and co-essential and co-
 eternal Trinity is added any younger or created
 or non-co-essential nature.
 B a And we preserve the doctrine of the
 incarnation of the Lord untwisted, by keeping
 the
 salvation of the flesh without a soul or without νοῦς
 or incomplete,
 b but in that we know unreservedly (ὅλον) the
 perfect God Logos, who was before the eons,
 who became fully human at the end of days for
 the sake of our salvation.

[260] While the Niceneum does not deal with the specifically Christological problem, this is done in the aforementioned Text II of 38220 in Part B. The statements contained therein are specifically directed against Apollinarius, even if his name is not mentioned.

20 See my essay cited in note 6.

is called. It was Apollinarius who - in the interest of a seemingly plausible unity of the person of Christ - wanted to ascribe to the divine Logos the function of *nous* (intellect) or soul in Christ. The Council participants, on the other hand, insist that the perfect Logos became a perfect, and therefore also a complete human being. While on the one hand we can pay attention to the use of Nicene statements in Part B, despite the need to respond to the problem posed by Apollinarius by defining the human aspects in Christ more precisely, on the other hand we should note the adoption of the "double completeness" of Christ in the Confessions of 433 (Text III Part A) and 451 (Text IV lines 5 and 6).

But the main emphasis in Text II is still on the doctrine of the Trinity, as the length of Part A in comparison with Part B shows. Part A consists of a single long sentence, in which the Greek construction of the absolute genitive occurs frequently and thus the possibility of compiling as many important provisions as possible in a condensed form. A I speaks of the unity of the Trinity, section II of the Trinity. The unity is to be found in the divinity, power and essence (*ousia*) of Father, Son and Spirit. Line Ic could seem like a baroque embellishment, but it is not. For here (as already observed above in the Niceno-Constantinopolitanum on another point) a connection is established with contemporaneous Roman theology; something happens here that we also find in the Roman Tomus Damasi: predication that are usually related to *one* of the persons of the Trinity are assigned to the predicates for the Trinitarian unity. The *homotimia* ("equal honor") was a term often used by Basil of Caesarea for the co-divinity of the *Spirit*. As is well known, this famous man could not bring himself to affirm the homoousia of the spirit. In the case of the equality of kingship, we come across a keyword that concerned the *Son* in disputes that took place between the Eusebians and Marcellus of Ancyra. So much for the statements about unity.

Part A II in our text speaks of the Trinity: the one Godhead is believed in three hypostases. In A I and A II we have the authoritative synodal text for the distinction between *ousia* and *hypostasis* in the Trinity, for the *d i s t i n c t i o n* that is not to be found in the Nicene-Constantinopolitanum. The theology of the Council of Constantinople, so frequently invoked in ecumenical debates, is present in our definitional text, which makes the *Nicene* doctrine of the Trinity *b i n d i n g*. The distinction between *ousia* and *hypostasis* means that the synonymy of these vocabularies has now been definitively abandoned for the doctrine of the Trinity in the Greek East. Whereas until then both *ousia* and *hypostasis* could mean the universal as well as the concrete individual, in the doctrine of the Trinity *ousia* becomes the commonality of the Godhead, the essence, while the three persons differ from each other as hypostases. We find the first traces of the differentiation of *ousia* and *hypostasis* around 358; the Meletians from Antioch carry

They presented it in 362 at the Synod of Alexandria, which was organized by Athanasius. The theologians of the Meletian party in turn determine the synods of 379, 381, 382, to which we owe our Text II. It is interesting that both Jerome and Augustine say that they did not know the distinction between *ousia* and *hypostasis* from philosophy; one can therefore wonder whether the differentiation was made specifically for the Trinitarian debate [262]. In any case, it made it possible to resolve the almost intractable opposition of one-hypostasis theology and three-hypostasis theology, as they faced each other in Marcellus of Ancyra on the one side and the Eusebians on the other. Although the compromise eliminated the subordination of the three Trinitarian Persons, which was an Origenist legacy, it also evoked the aforementioned danger of arriving at a doctrine of three equal gods, i.e. tri-theism. It was therefore necessary to prevent the three persons of the Trinity from appearing as merely three individuals of one *ousia*. This is achieved by *asynchytos henosis*, which could not be expressed by three specimens of one species. In Text II we find this addressed in defense of the teaching of "Sabellius" in section A IIb 1. "Sabellius pours the hypostases together", "abolishes their peculiarities" - that is wrong. From this it follows as a positive view of the authors that the "unmixed unity" of the three hypostases is to be taught correctly, so that their "peculiarities are preserved". The short formula for the neo-Nicene doctrine of the Trinity should therefore not just be "one *ousia*, three hypostases", but rather "one *ousia*, three hypostases in *asynchytos henosis* (unmixed unity)".

The solution to this monotheistic problem is not completely identical in the East and the West (Augustine); the Augustinian solution is still offensive to the East. Incidentally, the problem is becoming topical again today (as it was in the Middle Ages) in the debate with Islam, which sees the Christian Trinity as a breach of the commandment to worship the one God.

[263] Text III: Union Confession 433

(middle section of a longer document; Denzinger/Hünemann No. 272)

- A Ὁμολογοῦμεν τοιγαροῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν
τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ,
θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον
ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος,
πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα,
ἐπ' ἐσχάτου δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν
ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα,
ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν θεότητα
καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.
- B Δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἔνωσις γέγονεν-
δι' ὃ ἓνα Χριστόν, ἓνα υἱόν, ἓνα κύριον ὁμολογοῦμεν.

- C Κατὰ ταύτην τὴν τῆς ἀσυγχύτου ἐνώσεως ἔννοιαν
ὁμολογοῦμεν τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον θεοτόκον
διὰ τὸν θεὸν λόγον σαρκωθῆναι καὶ ἐνανθρωπῆναι
καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς συλλήψεως ἐνῶσαι ἑαυτῷ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς ληφθέντα ναόν.

[264] Translation III

- A We therefore confess our Lord Jesus Christ, the
only begotten Son of God,
perfect God and perfect man, of rational soul and
body,
born of the Father before the ages according to the Godhead,
but at the end of the days the same for our sake and because of
of our salvation from Mary the Virgin (born) according to humanity, the same in
essence as the Father according to the Godhead
and like us after mankind. B The
unification of two natures took place;
That is why we confess one Christ, one Son, one Lord.
C In accordance with this understanding of unmixed unification,
we confess the Blessed Virgin as the Mother of God,
because the God Logos became flesh and man
and (from the moment of) conception
united with himself the temple taken from her (sc. the virgin).

Text III, the Confession of Reconciliation of 43321, is a declaratory confession, in three parts, but not Trinitarian in structure, but entirely dedicated to Christology. It contains a series of sentences from the Niceneum in a new arrangement and the first half of Part A is also reminiscent of Text II of 382 (379/381), Part B, [265] with the double perfection and the anti-apollinarian point. Then there is the double homoousia at the end of this part, which is taken up again in Chalcedon. Part A thus describes Christ in his double relation to God and to us: this relation requires that he is both God and man, both in his essence (but note that the vocabulary *ousia* does not appear on its own, but is only contained in the adjective *homoousios*) and according to his origin. It is probably no coincidence that the birth of Christ is only mentioned once in the corresponding participle (*gennethenta*), in the conception from the Father; the Antiochians still avoid speaking explicitly of a "second birth of the Logos" here. On the other hand, the continuation with the origin from the Virgin Mary is constructed in such a way that a "born" is automatically added, as is also the case with

21 The following statements on III were not yet included in the oral presentation.

the German translation in Denzinger/Hünemann does, but "was born" should have been placed in brackets. If we want to compare Part A with the usual structure of Article II in a Trinitarian baptismal confession, we observe that statements which would belong to Articles IIa and IIb alternate in our text.

Part B laconically states the unification, *henosis*, of two natures in Christ; without this unification there would be no confession of the one Christ, Son, Lord. It is only in this part that the divinity and humanity of Christ are "abstractly" described as natures, thus taking up a main point of contention in the disputes between Cyril and Nestorius, but the next line immediately returns to the biblical and Nicene titles of the one Christ.

Part C concedes the use of the title Theotokos for Mary (which Nestorius had also done in Constantinople) on the basis of the correct understanding of the unity of the two natures. *How* the unity is to be understood, however, is only explained here (in a remarkable economy of literary means): it is the *asynchytos henosis*, the "unity not poured together". It implies that the natures are preserved in the unity, but again this is not explicitly stated here. At the end of part C, the unification is described in typical Antiochian terms. The reason for this is, of all things, *the theotokos*, which was brought to the fore by the Cyrillic side in Ephesus 431. The confession of *theotokos* is initially justified with the Nicene line "because the God Logos became flesh and man", which shifts the emphasis slightly. Ultimately, *theotokos* is understood correctly if one realizes what already happens "(at the moment of) conception": "the god Logos united with himself the temple taken from her (the Virgin)". The translation in Denzinger/Hünemann chooses the Greek *lambanein* (here as the participle *lephntenta*) instead of "take" is synonymous with "receive" (in a false analogy to *syllipsis* = "reception"); but "take", "receive" indicates the activity of the Logos in becoming human. The "temple" comes from a favorite passage of the Antiochian theologians, John 2:21: "But he spoke of the temple of his body", so "temple" stands for "body". - The effort required to make a reception of *the theotokos* in theologically responsible speech possible by the Antiochians is therefore very great. One can still sense the resistance that the all too direct, unreflectively literal use of the title of Mary originally provoked among the Antiochenes. However, one cannot help but admire the skill with which, in matters of *theotokos*, at least in this passage, the Antiochenes literally have the last word.

[267] Text IV: Chalcedon, 451

(Outline by J. Ortiz de Urbina, adopted by A. de Halleux; Rev. Théol. de Louvain 7 (1976) 9 = Patrologie et Œcuménisme, Louvain 1990, 451)²²

1. Ἐπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν
2. ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱὸν
3. τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν
4. συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν
5. τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι
6. καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι,
7. θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς
8. τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος,
9. ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα
10. καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα,
11. κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας,
12. πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα,
13. ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν
14. τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν
15. ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα
16. ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν υἱὸν κύριον μονογενῆ,
17. ἐν δύο φύσεσιν
18. ἀσυγχύτως ἀδιαιρέπτως ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον,
19. οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν,
20. σωιζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ιδιότητος ἐκατέρας φύσεως
21. καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης,
22. οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον,
23. ἀλλ' ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆ
24. θεὸν λόγον κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
25. καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ
26. καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσεν
27. καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον.

[268] Translation IV*

1. Following in the footsteps of the holy fathers
2. we all agree on this,
3. our Lord Jesus Christ
4. as one and the same son;

²² On this passage, see A. de Halleux, La définition christologique à Chalcédoine, in: RTL 7 (1976) 3-23, 155-170 = Patrologie et Œcuménisme. Recueil d'études, Louvain 1990, 445-480. With regard to the cross-references to the Tomus Leonis, see the supplementary corrections in my review in: ETL 69 (1993) 436 et seq.

* Lines 2 and 4 have been swapped with respect to the original for reasons of German sentence structure.

5. the same is perfect in the Godhead
6. and the same is perfect in humanity;
7. He is truly God and truly man
8. of rational soul and body;
9. the same is of the same essence as the Father according to the Godhead
10. and humanity after us,
11. equal to us in everything except sin (*cf. Heb 4:15*);
12. On the one hand, he was begotten of the Father before the ages, according to the Godhead,
13. on the other hand in the last few days
14. {according to mankind} ((the same = τὸν αὐτὸν) was born for our sake and for the sake of our salvation)*.
15. from Mary, the Virgin <and> Mother of God,
16. one and the same is Christ, the only begotten Son and Lord,
17. in two natures
18. is recognized as unmixed, unchangeable, undivided and indivisible,
19. whereby nowhere is the difference of natures abolished because of the unification,
20. rather, the peculiarity of each of the two natures is preserved
21. and unites in one person and one hypostasis;
22. not divided or separated into two persons,
23. but one and the same is the only begotten Son,
24. God, the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ,
25. as the prophets used to say about him
26. and Jesus Christ himself taught us
27. and the confession of the fathers has handed it down to us.

[269] The core of the Tomus of Chalcedon is constructed as a single long sentence in which almost all statements about Christ are in the accusative. All the more striking are lines 19 to 21, in which a genitive absolutus breaks through this construction. These lines represent an insertion; we know that the famous four adverbs in line 18 were also included in the text of the definition on this occasion.

If we first look at the text as it was originally conceived, we notice the care taken in the structure by the way in which the beginning and the end are related to each other. The "Fathers" who are followed are those of Nicaea; at the end they are placed in a succession of doctrine and tradition: Prophets, Jesus Christ himself, the symbol. The "symbol" is that of Nicaea, the Nicaean-Constantinopolitanum is to be subsumed under it in the context of the *whole* Tomus, becomes

* [The text of the translation has probably been reprinted and corrected here according to the Greek original - *ed.*]

it is understood as a necessary completion of the Nicene. But for the author of the basic text of our definition, this cannot be postulated with the same self-understanding.

The confession of "one and the same" Son and Lord Jesus Christ appears three times like a refrain (lines 2 f., 16, 23 f. of the Greek original), whereby the number of titulatures increases: in line 16 "only begotten" is added, 23 f. also still "God Logos". These repetitions are simultaneously intensifications. The double perfection and the double homoousia, the anti-apollinarian specification (line 5), the (already Nicene) soteriological accent with the salvation-historical "Dating" according to Heb 1:2 and the title Theotokos for Mary are familiar to us from the Confession of Union of 433. In contrast, there is a reference to the sinlessness of the human Christ, who is otherwise "like" us in every respect (line 11). The Antiochian reference to the temple "assumed by the Logos" is missing. The repeated unity statements permeate everything that is explained about the double homoousia etc., so to speak.

The twofold aspect of the one Christ is presented with slightly different positive and negative vocabulary in the words "recognized in two natures" (line 17) (end of line 18) "and not divided and separated into two persons" (line 22), which belong to the original. We are also familiar with the reference to "two natures" from the Confession of 433. should mean "recognized in two natures"; but one can probably say as much that the two natures should continue to exist in unity, but not in such a way that they become two different figures, persons. This latter negative colon is directed against misunderstood statements by Nestorius.

The fact that the draft was supplemented at this point indicates that it was not considered sufficiently differentiated and specific in view of the problems at hand. It was obviously not enough to merely mention the fact of the existence of two natures in Christ and to ward off any misunderstanding of this fact. Rather, it was necessary to develop how unity and duality in Christ should be understood. For this purpose, the conceptual field of *asynchytos henosis* is used more completely than it was in 433. It includes not only the four adverbs of line 18, but also everything that is said in lines 19 and 20. While the four adverbs, which incidentally are not easy to place or assign grammatically in the sentence structure, emphasize distinction ("unmixed, untransformed") on the one hand and unity ("undivided, undivided") in Christ on the other, two whole lines are devoted to the distinction of natures and the preservation of their peculiarities, which should not be abolished by the unity. While the basic text averts the danger of two "persons" in Christ (line 22), the insertion conversely wants to prevent a seemingly dangerous conclusion from the unity. However, this passage ends with a statement about the unity of Christ that sounds more "technical" than the emphasis on the self-sufficiency of the one Christ in the basic text; line 21 speaks of

the one person and the one hypostasis in Christ. The use of the term *hypostasis* for the one Christ, in the Chalcedonian debates and here, within the insertion, no doubt a concession to the Cyrillians, creates the systematic difficulty that the God Logos as one of three Trinitarian hypostases and the whole Christ as one Christological hypostasis are not quite congruent. In the sixth century, great efforts were made to obtain a more precise definition of the one Christological hypostasis. In contrast to Harnack's dismissive judgment of the four negative adverbs (he was not yet familiar with the entire complex of *asynchytos henosis*), a religious dimension of their meaning can certainly be inferred. I refer here to my considerations made on another occasion²³, from which I take the following: The nomenclature of *asynchytos henosis*, used by the philosophers initially for the mental-spiritual realm, from there transferred to the noetic-divine, namely to the relation of the one to the many, of the nous to the ideas, in this version relates decidedly to the realm of the incorporeal, that which is not subject to the laws of physics. It has therefore been found appropriate for use in the doctrine of the Trinity and Christology. As in the doctrine of the Trinity, it has also been used in Christology when one had to defend one's own doctrine of distinction against a doctrine of unity, while at the same time one could not neglect the concern for unity without being able to adopt the opposing articulation of the same. Its significance for Christology lies in the fact that it allowed adherence to the completeness of Christ's human nature. This explains the function of this nomenclature in the Chalcedonense: it is intended to balance or even eliminate the connotations of an organ unity comparable to the human, which adhere to the one hypostasis of Cyril from its (apollinaristic) origin. In this theological context, the language of "unmixed unity" is an expression of the divine, superhuman character of the unity of God and man in Christ. Its wonder for us is that this can be said of one who lived and suffered as we do.

The dialectic expressed in the four negative adverbs of our text could be considered a highly unsatisfactory result; but it speaks for the power of divine and human reality and truth, which are to be expressed simultaneously. The theological sting of the mono-theistic claim and the scandal of the earthly, which is supposed to be divine, are still present. It is to be regarded as a merit of discernment Christology that its Greek theological insistence on the immutability of God has preserved the human nature of Christ as a theologoumenon despite all the widespread early church Christological tendencies towards deification. Our task today is to de-

23 See the essay mentioned in note 4, for the following therein 105, 108 f.

and their conditions are much more difficult. In any case, the man Jesus has remained with us; it is important to speak of the binding nature of his message and the authority of his person in the face of general atheism in such a way that it becomes possible to speak of God in a new way. [p. 273 endnotes 4-23 follow in the original - *ed.*]

5.5 The Spirit as a "bond" between Father and Son - a theologoumenon of the Eusebians?1

Athanasius (in the first part of his III Arian Discourse²) as well as Markell of Ankyra (in the "Western" Serdicense³) combat an otherwise unknown text of the Eusebians and have thus preserved for us some thoughts and key words of these opponents for which we do not have other sources⁴. We can deduce that the Eusebians used chapters 10, 14 and 17 of the Gospel of John for their Trinitarian argumentation; it was important to them to interpret Christ's statements about his unity with the Father and about the unity of believers with one another *and* in the Father and Son in a certain sense.

Both in the Serdicense and in Athanasius we find that the Eusebians ascribed a function or role for the constitution of unity to the Holy Spirit in order to explain the Johannine statements on unity. In doing so, they go beyond the text of the Gospel, where the Spirit is not mentioned in the passages in question.

Let us start with the serdicense. For our specific problem, only the last section should be consulted, § 12 in Martin Tetz's outline⁵. [127] Markell reproaches the opponents for not understanding in what way it is said (sc. in the high priestly prayer) "since they also are one in us", ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὣσιν ἐν ὧσι (John 17:21)⁶. The author continues: "It is clear why 'one': because the apostles received the Holy Spirit of God; but nevertheless they were not themselves spirit, nor was one of them Logos or Sophia or Dynamis, nor was

1 The following was presented in abridged form at the 1995 International Patristic Conference in Oxford and was then intended for a commemorative publication scheduled for 1997. Changes in the planning of the latter have now prompted me to publish it here
Place. In terms of content, this is a first addition to the sketch that I presented as an excursus within my treatise "Zur Trinitätslehre des Thomas von Aquin". This lecture in ZThK 92/4, 1995, 466-480, the excursus 468-471.

2 The first part comprises chapters 1-25.

3 Together with others, I consider Markell's authorship of this confession to be established.

4 For the partially common front position of Athanasius and Markell in the aforementioned writings s. L. Abramowski, Die dritte Arianerrede des Athanasius. Eusebians and Arians and the Western Serdicense, ZKG 102, 1991, 389-413, here 395-398 [here in this volume pp. 307-330].

5 M. Tetz, Ante omnia de sancta fide et de integritate veritatis. Questions of faith at the Synod of Serdika (342), ZNW 76, 1985, 243-269. The text of the Serdicense therein 252-254, § 12 254. In Theodorich Church History, GCS 44, 1954, ed. Parmentier/Scheidweiler, § 12 corresponds to section 117,12-118,4, with a different paragraph numbering.

6 I quote the text in the form in which the editors of KG Theodoret's communicate it, because otherwise would have to discuss every single one of Tetz's emendations, which would take up too much space. I immediately contradict one of these emendations (see above) and will in turn propose one for this section of the notoriously poorly transmitted text.

not monogenes". Tetz wants to improve the colon "but nevertheless they were not themselves spirit" by changing ἦσαν, "were", to ἐκλήθησαν with the Latin version,

"were called"; he calls this *lectio difficilior* - in fact, it is a facilitating reading. The fact that the reading ἦσαν must be retained becomes clear from Markell's subsequent *reductio ad absurdum*, since none of the apostles "was" λόγος, σοφία etc., ἦν.

Indirectly, it follows from Markell's words that the Eusebians saw the unification of the believers as taking place through the Holy Spirit - an idea which, taken by itself, no one will want to describe as false. It is Markell's *interpretation* of the Eusebian statement that he thinks the work of the Spirit is mediated by the *apostles*; the last lines of § 127 confirm this, in which there is no longer any mention of the Holy Spirit.

In the sequence just quoted: "because the apostles received the Holy Spirit; but nevertheless they were not themselves spirit", the sequence of the two colons seems to me rather abrupt. I wonder whether, as in two other cases I have previously considered⁸, a loss through homoioteleuton has not occurred, so that one should insert after ἀλλ': "although the apostles πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἔλαβον", and then continue with the existing text: "nevertheless they were not themselves spirit".

Markell's next argument concerns the ἐν ἡμῖν of the Johannine text⁹; of course, this is a mere suggestion that can only be understood with the help of Athanasius' detailed explanations of the same ἐν ἡμῖν in Ctr. III 21 and 22 about the same ἐν ἡμῖν.

While the Serdicense works with allusions that are not easy to decipher, in Athanasius we have chapters 17-25 of III. C. 17 contains two quotations from the Eusebians (Athanasius speaks of "Arians"). They are more recent: ἐφεύρομεν καιννοτέρων (sc. ἐπίνοιαν), Athanasius puts into the mouths of the Eusebians

[128] a) In the Athenian print¹⁰ 264.17 οὕτως - 30 ἀπέστειλας. This first quotation consists of

mainly from John 17:11 and 20-23, which verses provide the justification for the opinion of the Eusebians with which the quotation begins: "So the Son and the Father are one, and so the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father, ὡς ἂν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ γενοίμεθα = as we also are well in him; for this is written in the Gospel of John, what Christ requested for us, saying:" - the biblical passages given follow;

b) 264,31 εἰ - 37 ἀλλότριον: John 10,30 and 14,10 are also used here. In this quotation, the Eusebians turn against the unity of the οὐσία of Father and Son and argue as follows: "If *as* we are one in the Father

⁷ Theodoret, 117,20-118,4.

⁸ Abramowski, Arianerrede (see note 4) 399 f. [here in this volume p. 317 f.].

⁹ Theodoret, 117,17-118,4.

¹⁰ "Ἐκδοσις τῆς ἀποστολικῆς διακονίας, Athens 1962 (vol. 30 of Βιβλιοθήκη ἐλλήνων πατέρων κτλ.).

(γινόμεθα), *so* also he and the Father are one (sic), and *so* also he is in the Father - how do you deduce from his speech 'I and the Father are one', and: 'I in the Father, and the Father in me', since he is his own and the same (ἴδιον καὶ ὁμοιον) of the οὐσία of the Father¹¹? Necessarily, either we are also our own (ιδίους) of the οὐσία of the Father, or that one (the Son) is also alien (ἀλλότριον), just as we are also alien (ἀλλότριοι)".

The Eusebians therefore maintain that our unity in the Father is the same as the unity of the Son with the Father, and our being in the Father the same as the Son's being in the Father, and above all that the Son's being in the Father (and their unity) is to be understood from our being in the Father (and from *our* unity in him).

In the following chapters Athanasius endeavors to resolve this equation. Since for the Eusebians the equation is connected with the conclusion from our relationship to the Father to that of the Son to the Father, this one-way conclusion must also be rejected. This happens not only by simply reversing the direction, but also by dissolving the close, unmediated relationship that prevails in the statements of the Johannine Jesus between the two kinds of unity into a merely mediated one. There is no doubt that this means a weakening of the Johannine text, at least as far as our unity is concerned. "What is given to men by grace, they" (sc. the Eusebians) "want it to be equal to the giving Godhead", says Athanasius towards the end of c. 17 (265.2 f.). "What is given to men by grace" can be regarded as an anticipatory heading for the following pages.

I will not follow Athanasius' line of argument in detail, nor will I merely enumerate it, [129] but I will only pick out what concerns the topic of this contribution. Thus, as in the Serdicense, the Spirit also has a mediating function for Athanasius between us and God: "But we are made sons by adoption and grace, by sharing in his Spirit", c. 19 (266.36 f.). In c. 21 we hear of the "bond of love", σύνδεσμος τῆς ἀγάπης, which we can "have as one in the name of the Father and of the Son, as one" (268:19-21). The "bond of love" is a deutero-Pauline expression (Col 3:14); in the Third Arian Discourse we find it again in the last sentence of c. 2312, at the end of a series of thoughts formulated as a discourse on Christ. This last sentence of c. 23 represents a further contribution to the interpretation of the ἐν ἡμῖν of John 17:21, combined with a typical Athanasian thought: "They" (sc. the believers) "no longer remain dead, but deified (θεοποιηθέντες)

¹¹ Here the Eusebians reproach Athanasius with his own key words, as he uses them in Contra Arianos I and II. Analogous behavior among the Arians, see Abramowski, Arianerrede (see note 4) 408 [here in this volume p. 325 f.].

¹² BKV writes "word" in this sentence where "work" should be. Eleven lines further up it says: "We therefore in them, Father!", that should correctly read: "*Work* therefore in them, Father!".

they have, ἐν ἡμῖν βλέποντες, among themselves the σύνδεσμος τῆς ἀγάπης". ἐν ἡμῖν βλέποντες can only mean: "looking at us" (BKV: "looking up to us"), which certainly falls short of the opinion of the Johannine text. Outside the III Arianerrede, Müller's Lexicon gives only one other place where Athanasius speaks of σύνδεσμος τῆς ἀγάπης, namely in the Apologia ctr. Arianos.

In c. 23 there is also the strange sentence (269,31 f.): ὁθεν αὐτὸς μὲν ὁ υἱός, ἀπλῶς καὶ χωρὶς συμπλοκῆς τινός ἐστιν ἐν τῷ πατρὶ· φύσει γὰρ ὑπάρχει τοῦτ' αὐτῷ = "Therefore the Son himself is simply and without συμπλοκῆς τινός in the Father; by nature this is true of him" ¹³, συμπλοκή means connection; in Athanasius' grammatical usage it is synonymous with σύνδεσμος (s. G. Müller [ed.], Lexicon Athanasia- num, Berlin 1952), so the synonymity of συμπλοκή and σύνδεσμος can also be assumed for the other usage by Athanasius. Then it can also be translated as the σύνδεσμος of Col 3:14 with "volume". We must ask whether τινός is to be taken adjectivally - "any band" - or whether it is to be understood substantivally as a further genitive object - "band of ..." or "band of ...". According to the context, it makes sense to first use "of love" for τινός. The συμπλοκή τινός would therefore be the rejected Eusebian view of the unity of Father and Son, ἀπλῶς would have the meaning of "immediate" in this context. The opinion of Athanasius is then as follows: "Therefore the Son himself is direct and without bond of anything in the Father; by nature this is true of him". Considering this, the assumption arises that it was already the Eusebians who worked with Col 3:14. Did they [130] perhaps also draw a conclusion for the unity of Father and Son from this passage?

The view of Athanasius' opponents becomes clearest to us from c. 24. Athanasius draws from John 4:13 the explanation of how *we* are in God and he in us: through the grace of the Spirit, through the Spirit. 270,23-28: *Not* as the Son is in the Father, are we also in the Father. "The Son does *not* share in the Spirit (μετέχων ἐστὶ τοῦ πνεύματος) so that he may thereby be in the Father; he is *not the* recipient (λαμβάνων ἐστὶ) of the Spirit, but he himself offers it to all; and the Spirit *does not* unite (or: unites) the Spirit the Logos with the Father (καὶ οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸν λόγον συνάπτει τῷ πατρὶ), but rather the Spirit receives from the Logos (cf. John 16:5)". For Athanasius, the correct understanding is that the Son is "his own" Logos and reflection in the Father, whereas without the Spirit we are alien to the Father and far from him; it is our participation in the Spirit that unites us with the Godhead (270:28-31).

The proposition that the πνεῦμα connects the Logos with the Father seems to me to be Eusebian among the rejected views of the relationship between Son and Spirit

¹³ The translation in BKV shows how difficult the sentence is to understand as long as the actual point of contention is not understood: "Therefore the Son himself is *absolute* and *without any addition* in the Father. For this comes to him by nature."

or united¹⁴. From it, the statement of the συμπλοκή τινός in c. 23 becomes fully clear: it is the συμπλοκή πνεύματος, the Spirit as a bond (genitivus explicativus) between Father and Son.

We can therefore, with some difficulty, identify an attempt by the Eusebians *before* Serdica¹⁵

to arrive at more satisfactory statements about the unity of Father and Son than before, without, however, designating the unity with the vocabulary οὐσία, finding it in the one οὐσία or φύσις. As a biblical starting point, they took the strongest statements of unity that we have, namely those from the Gospel of John. John 17 offered them intellectual access to the mystery of inner-divine unity because, as already mentioned, this also brings about our unity with one another as such in the divine. With the threefold καθώς of John 17:11, 21, 22, they were able to justify their inference from our unity as one in the divine unity to the divine unity itself. No wonder that from c. 18 to 22 Athanasius has to develop a hermeneutic of comparison, especially the biblical one, in order to defuse the Johannine καθώς as a sign of equality and to allow on our, the believers', side only imitation of the divine παράδειγμα.

Both from what Markell indicates in the Serdicense and from Athanasius' train of thought, it is clear that the Eusebians understood *our* unity with one another as that of the Holy Spirit and of love, with biblical evidence that is easy to provide; the "bond of love" is the [131] Holy Spirit, who acts as love and therefore as the unifying force among us. With the help of the καθώς and the divine ἐν ἡμῖν, this was transferred to the inner-divine relationship: the Spirit was now the bond that unites the Logos and the Father, συνάπλοκή. Admittedly, the direct intra-Trinitarian use of this vocabulary could *not be* proven biblically. However, there are striking parallels in the Oracula chaldaica for the connection of the first and second in the divine through the third¹⁶, which could have been gratefully used for the new theological question. After all, we know how well Euseb of Caesarea understood Porphyrius and, through him, the theological question posed by the New Plato.

¹⁴ The two preceding sentences are probably the mere reversal of Athanasius' opinion.

¹⁵ What Athanasius has the Eusebians say in c. 17 about their "*newer* view" is chronologically seriously.

¹⁶ Cited in Abramowski, Trinitätslehre (see note 1) 470 with notes 14 and 16. Firstly, it is Oracula chaldaica fragment 31 of the Places: ἐξ ἀμφοῖν δὴ τῶνδε ῥέει τριάδος δέμα πρώτης / οὐσης οὐ πρώτης ἀλλ' οὗ τὰ νοητά μετρεῖται. It is the first line of this fragment that is important here. Secondly, the introduction of the Proclus († 485) to fragment 4 of the Place, quoted by R. Majercik, The Chaldean Oracles. Text, translation and commentary, Leiden 1989, in which Proclus refers to an oracle opinion: πανταχοῦ γὰρ ἡ δύναμις τὸ μέσον κεκλήρωται καὶ ἐν μὲν τοῖς νοητοῖς συνάπτει τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν νοῦν. Augustine knew the corresponding oracle passage as Porphyrian and did not want to understand its Trinitarian transferability ("non intelligo"), see the passage from De civitate dei X,23, quoted by Majercik, 8 note 1.

tonics knew the traditional oracle material. Athanasius would hardly have recognized this, otherwise his polemics would probably have taken on other characteristics.

All this could be quickly forgotten as an episode in the history of Eusebian theology that is almost no longer noticeable, if Athanasius had not contradicted the well-known topos of Augustine's doctrine of the Trinity with the sentence that the Spirit does not unite the Logos with the Father, long before Augustine could have developed it. The question is whether there is not a literary connection. Of course, this cannot be established through a knowledge of Augustine's III Arian discourse, because not only would there have been far too little to learn about it here, but Athanasius also denounces the topos as Arian, which would have ruled out its use by Augustine. On the other hand, Augustine's doctrine of the Spirit as the bond of the Trinity is accompanied by typical Eusebian expressions, as we know them from the Formula makrostichos and from Euseb himself, but these are again supplemented in Neo-Nicene - thus the unity of "equals", *aequalia*, is explicitly mentioned. As an intermediate link, we must therefore postulate a writing in which the Eusebian attempt to explain the unity between Father and Son in the way I reconstructed it earlier¹⁷ was both taken up and reworked in Neo-Nicene. At this stage, I would assume a consistent concentration on the intra-Trinitarian problem, abandoning the analogy of the unity of believers [132] as the starting point of the train of thought, but using the equation "bond of love" = "bond of the Spirit" derived from this analogy. While I recently wrote: "Until we know better, Augustine's definition of the bond of unity as *love* will probably have to be regarded as his own contribution to the further development of the idea"¹⁸, we now actually know better as a result of the above investigation.

Such a neo-Nicene adaptation of the text opposed by Athanasius could not have taken place before 362 and was presumably still an undertaking in the Greek-speaking world. A Latin translation of the postulated Trinitarian treatise can be assumed as a further link to Augustin. Whatever the path may have looked like that led from the originally Eusebian concept to Augustine, it had an effect through him that Athanasius and Markell could never have even dreamed of. And we realize once again that the discussions about the doctrine of the Trinity between 340 and the beginning of the 5th century were even more colorful and multifaceted than we already knew, and that at the same time, completely unexpected cross-fertilizations were taking place.

connections open up.

¹⁷ I am thus modifying my assumptions made in the Thomas essay (see note 1) 469 and 471 about the nature of the literary relationships between the Eusebian writing that Athanasius has in mind and what Augustine read.

¹⁸ Abramowski, Trinitätslehre (see note 1) 471.

5.6 The meeting of the Council of Ephesus on July 22, 431 "On the attachment of the symbol of the holy fathers of Nicaea and on the libellus handed over by the presbyter Charisius"

Only the *Collectio Atheniensis* (= A) of the Ephesian Acts, edited in ACO I 1,7, discussed by the editor Eduard Schwartz in the Praefatio of ACO I 1,4, contains negotiations of the Cyrillic Synod on regional problems: A 73-79 on the request of the presbyter Charisius from Philadelphia in Lydia, A 80 on the Messalians, A 81 on the independence of the Church of Cyprus, A 82 on the bishops of the province of Europe (that is the hinterland of Constantinople), A 83 on a former metropolitan in Pamphylia, cf. ACO I 1,4, p. XVII. Pieces of quite different scope have been taken from the respective minutes, sometimes only the decision of the synod. One exception is the complex A 73-79: here, not only was a selection made from the minutes of the session of July 22 (date ACO I 1,7, p. 84,33), but considerable additions were made to this selection in a subsequent revision. These additions originate almost entirely from the *first* session of the Cyrillic Synod of June 22, 431, as Schwartz was easily able to show, ACO I 1,4, p. XVIII-XXI; the references are given in the appendix to I 1,7. In between, smaller pieces have also been specially formulated for editing, as I will note below. According to Schwartz I 1,4, p. XVIII f., the editor of the original *Gesta* was not just any later scribe, but presumably Cyril himself. In the note to I 1,7, p. 88,33 (a note that would fit better with the "fortification" in the heading p. 84,29), Schwartz quotes from Cyril's letter to Acacius of Beroea, A 107,5 (I 1,7, p. 149,3 ff.): In Ephesus there had been an *idikon hypomnēma* which "fortified" the faith of the Nicene Fathers, with the addition of quotations from the Fathers. What Cyril means is the first part of the session of July 22 in the edited form.

The result of the editing is given a heading (I 1,7, p. 84,28-30), which indicates the twofold content of what follows; it can be read at the top of the title of this study. The minutes themselves begin, true to form, with the date of the meeting and the meeting place, the episcopate of Bishop Memnon of Ephesus (p. 84,31-36). Incidentally, the date is not only given in [383] Latin, but also according to Egyptian counting, a clear indication of the Alexandrian redaction of this particular complex. The list of participants of the *first* session of June 22 is then copied, with 157 names (p. 84-88). In any case, one could not imagine how 157 people could have met in the bishop's house; not to mention the 197 people on list A 79, i.e. at the end - is the latter a list of signatures drawn up by circulation?

After A 73, the borrowed list of participants, in A 74 § 1 the Alexandrian chief notary Petrus opens the course of business of the meeting of July 22, as can be seen from the

The content of his announcement is to be inferred from the Latin version ACO I 3, p. 120,34 (in addition to the care of "your" synod for the faith, it also shows care for the *disciplina* and *ordinatio ecclesiarum*, cf. the Latin version ACO I 3, p. 120,34; this refers to the regional problems listed above). He has the *horos* that the synod has produced in his hands and wants to read it out if it pleases the assembly. The Synod agrees, § 2:

"The *horos* produced by this (= our) holy and ecumenical synod is to be read out and added to the Acts". - The two §§ 1 and 2 obviously form the connection to p. 84,31-34 within the beginning of A 73 and, together with that passage, are to be regarded as remnants of the original, unedited Acts text.

The Nicene Creed follows immediately in A 74 § 3, without any transitional formula or justification. Even this confession has been taken over from the first session, for the lemma is the same as there: "The Synod in Nicaea set forth this faith" (p. 89,3). - Incidentally, if one looks back from § 3 to § 2, this seems like the missing transition to the Nicene Creed - with or without the intention of the editor? I almost suspect that Schwartz also saw it this way (see his note mentioned above), and I myself initially read it this way.

The Niceneum is followed by a remark (§ 4, p. 89,14-20) which *does not originate* from the first session, i.e. was written by the editor. It is intended to lead over to A 75, its content is: Everyone must agree to this faith, for it is pious and sufficient for a useful life "under heaven". But there are people who claim to profess this faith, who misinterpret it and interpret the truth according to their own opinion, "sons of error and children of perdition", which is why it is necessary to interpret and proclaim sayings. - In other words, the Nicene alone is supposedly enough - but then it is not. For the other side, of course, also invoked the Nicene Creed.

A 75 now copies the paternal florileg of the first session, *together with* the lines of the preliminary remarks in the minutes; four quotations are appended at the end, representing the editor's original contribution to this copy (p. 89-95).

A 76 (p. 95,15 ff.) offers a second introduction within the edited session; in the Latin version it is preceded, as it should be: "After this had been read out, the presbyter of Alexandria and chief notary said:", ACO I 3, p. 128,1. What he then says characterizes the preceding as a decision on the Nicene faith. Six and a half [384] lines in the genitivus absolutus are necessary for this: The holy synod of bishops everywhere, assembled in Ephesus at the command of the emperors from "almost" the entire ecumenical community, "has defined" (*horizousēs*) "that valid and established" (*kratein kai bebaian einai*) the faith, "which was set forth by the Holy Spirit" by the holy fathers assembled in Nicaea, 318 in number, (they, the Ephesian Synod) *has formulated (typousēs) it in a manner befitting this matter*" (this is the self-description of the editor's work!). - This means that, in the editor's sense, A 74 § 3 - A 75 end (p. 89,3-95,18) would be the *horos* of the Ephesian Synod on the Niceneum. In fact, however, it is his own work.

After the long genitivus absolutus, the first word of the main clause is "Charisius" (p. 96,2), which begins a summarizing speech on the probably oral report of Charisius, presbyter and economist of the church of Philadelphia. At the end of the presentation, reference is made to the libellus submitted by Charisius, which follows just like the point of complaint, namely an ekthesis on the Incarnation, after which one reads the list of those who signed the "exposition" in Philadelphia (p. 96-105). The understanding of these documents is complicated by three mystifications, only one of which can be explained directly from the documents themselves.

1) The starting point of the events Charisius describes is the desire to "some of the heretics from Lydia" to turn to the Catholic Church. Who the "heretics" are only becomes clear from the third of the three anathemata that were attached to the Ekthesis for signature (p.100 above, here lines 2-4): "Anyone who does not celebrate the holy day of *Pascha* according to the setting of the holy and catholic church is anathema". These are therefore quartadecimans; in the abjuration formulas, their self-designation is *tessareskaidekatitēs* (a polemical term apparently invented by Epiphanius). Why are these people so generally counted among the heretics and not called by name?

2) In any case, in Charisius' opinion, these "unfortunates" (p. 96,14) fall into a much worse heresy by signing the text presented to them. The author of that text remains anonymous; because his work was presented to the Quartadecimans as orthodox, it is described in the editorial heading as *paraplastic*.

"subordinated" (p. 97,25) (I take the genitive of *ekthesis* explicative). The Latin translations of the Acts render the participle with its first inapplicable meaning: "transformatum", surprisingly followed by Schwartz (ACO I 1,4, p. XVIII). The anonymity is revealed in Cyril's letter to John of Antioch, which belongs to the final phase of the dispute about Theodore and Diodorus after the Peace of 433 (439/440? p. ZKG 67, 1955/6, p. 34-36). Schwartz edited it critically in his "Konzilstudien" (Strasbourg 1914) in two different Latin translations; it is now available in the large edition in ACO I 5, p. 314 f. (Coll. Sich. 15) in the Collections on the Ephesian Council and in IV I, p. 105 f. in the Acts of the Council of 553. In the first place, the lemma has the closer definition

"pro Theodoro", because [385] Cyril accepts the argument of the other side that one should not subsequently condemn those who have died in peace with the Church; in the second place, on the other hand, one speaks of the "conficta epistula" (sc. 'Cyril's)! The letter belongs to the Cyrillic "pieces that were so unpleasant to the Constantinople court theologians that they denied their authenticity" (Schwarz, Konzilstudien p. 62). One naturally wonders why this letter was nevertheless included in the records of the 5th Council. The reason is the statements about the "subordinated" Ekthesis presented by Charisius in Ephesus and its author. The Ekthesis itself is listed among the Theodore texts of the 5th Council to be condemned, ACO IV 1,

p. 70-72, under the heading "scelestum symbolon impii Theodori Mopsuestensi". In the Latin translations of the Ephesian Acts, the anonymity of the Ekthesis has already been removed and Theodore is indicated as its author, see the app. to ACO I 1.7, p. 97.25.

In his aforementioned letter to John of Antioch, Cyril speaks of the expositio (= *ekthesis*) as "tamquam a Theodoro exposita, sicut dicebant qui protulerunt, nihilo sanum habente". The Synod rebuked them as being full of "distorted understanding" and condemned those who thought the same way. "Dispensative (= *oikono- mikōs*) nullum fecit viri mentionem nec ipsum nominatim anathemati subiecit nec vero alios", because of the high esteem in which Theodore was held by the Orientals present, so that they would not separate themselves from communion with the body of the universal church (reported here according to the version in ACO IV 1, p. 106). It can be seen that *Charisius had presented the Ekthesis as Theodore's text to the Cyrillic Synod* and that the anonymity was a result of the synodal direction. The paper on Charisius' report and probably the Libellus itself were obviously reviewed from the point of view mentioned by Cyril before being included in the records: Charisius may even have been prevented from mentioning Theodore's name for the oral presentation. The "Orientals present" must have been those bishops of the diocese of Oriens who had joined the Cyrillic Synod and whom one did not want to lose out of self-interest.

Instead, relations (in terms of content) to Nestorius were established and the disagreement with the Niceneum was condemned, both in the paper on the Charisius report (I 1,7, p. 96,8 and 11) and in the Libellus (p. 96,25 and 97,5) and in the definition (p. 105.22 Nicaea); with Schwartz I 1.4, p. XVIII, the inclusion of Nestorius' "perverse dogmata" in the latter, together with the indication that they were "added below" (I 1.7, p. 106.4), is to be regarded as a small insertion by the editor.

"Attached below" is the florilege of Nestorius' quotations from the 1st session of the Synod (p. 106-111) including the derisive remark of Primicerius Petrus at the end (p. 111,30 f.).

In CPG II, the Ekthesis is listed as no. 3871 among Theodore's Spuria with reference to R. Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste* (ST 141) 1948, 256 f. (there is no addition to this number in the Supplementum of the CPG of 1998). But Devreesse's justifications are not tenable: he belittles Cyril's statements in the letter to John (p. 228. [386] 256); the argumentation of the African Facundus, the excellent defender of the Three Chapters, is not correctly reproduced in its intention (p. 256 n. 13). Devreesse's decisive argument that "this symbol" does not correspond "at all" to that which Theodore explains in his catecheses (p. 257) betrays an all too narrow concept of confession of faith, but above all it does not take into account the editorial character of the heading of the Ekthesis (ACO I 1,7, p. 97,25), which takes up the keyword "symbolon" from the lecture, where we read that the Ekthesis is "composed as if in the manner of a symbol", p. 96,13. In fact, it begins with the doctrine of the Trinity, and then very much

to treat the *oikonomia* much more broadly, from the Incarnation to the Last Judgement. The factually correct title is without doubt that given in the transition from the lecture to the Libellus: "Ekthesis on the Incarnation of the only begotten Son of God", p. 96,16 f. In terms of its content, there is not the slightest reason to consider Theodore its author. The Ekthesis is written for the more precise instruction of those, as it says at the beginning, who are "being instructed for the first time" or "want to pass over to the truth from some heretical error". Since Theodore died in 428 and the whole Charisius affair took place during Nestorius' Constantinian period of office (i.e. between 428 and the Ephesian Synod), the Ekthesis is older than this affair and was not written specifically for the Lydian Quartadecimans. The actual target group results from the Trinitarian statements: it is the Eunomians. I hope to be able to comment on this elsewhere.*

3) The third mystification concerns the sequence of events that led to the reception of Philadelphian Quartadecimans into the Catholic Church.

In the lecture on Charisius' oral report, we hear: Two ("alleged"!) presbyters, Anthony and James, came from Constantinople with letters from the ("alleged") presbyters Anastasius and Photius, both "at the time" "in the vicinity" of the "heretic" Nestorius. Instead of presenting the apostolic and evangelical faith tradition of the Nicene fathers to the erring, as was appropriate, they brought the ekthesis with them. - Had the Lydian "heretics" themselves turned to Constantinople with a request for instruction? Would not their local bishop have been the first address for them? -

In the Libellus, after a lengthy introduction about the false faith of Nestorius and the synod convened by the emperors on his account, we read that the comrades of his godlessness, the presbyters Anastasius and Photius (see above), worked to spread this false faith in other cities. To this end, they sent out James (see above, Antony is not mentioned here), who thought like them and whom they granted table fellowship and trust by recommending him by letter to the Lydian bishops as orthodox. When he arrived in Philadelphia, he got some of the *simpliciores* (clerics at that) to sign the ekthesis of another faith, claiming them to be orthodox. Let not only the ekthesis be read aloud in the synod, but also the letters of the aforementioned (i.e. the Constantinopolitan presbyters Anastasius and Photius, who recommended James as orthodox, but removed him, Charisius, [387] from *koinonia* and *leiturgia* as a heretic). To prove his own orthodoxy, he adds a (Nicene) confession (which, however, is not literally the Niceneum). - Although the Libellus speaks of the Lydian bishops in general, it does not mention

* [Until the completion of the manuscript, it could not be determined whether L. A. was still able to fulfill this announcement - *ed.*]

Here, too, the impression is created that the whole affair was run by press agents on both sides.

This cannot be entirely true. From the information already quoted about "some of the heretics of *Lydia*", the intention of the Constantinople presbyters to "false faith" "in *other cities*", the mission of James *to the Lydian bishops* (certainly Antony was engaged in the same way, but James came to Philadelphia), it follows that the willingness of Quartadecimans to join the Catholic Church was not only expressed in Philadelphia. This had to concern the respective bishops. I would like to assume that the bishops of Lydia came to an understanding among themselves about the phenomenon (which was pleasing for them) and decided (at a provincial synod?) on a uniform approach. This required agreement on what was to be demanded of the "heretics", both negative and positive. On the positive side, consent to the *ekklesiastika dogmata* was to be demanded, see the first of the three anathemata at the end of the Ekthesis (ACO I 1.7, p. 100.1 f.). This in turn required an authoritative formulation of "ecclesiastical doctrine".

Were the two presbyters Antony and James, who "came down from Constantinople" (p. 96,7 f.), perhaps sent there first by the Lydian bishops (gathered at a synod?)? What was the scope of their mission? Were they to bring with them a useful summary of church doctrine? Such an inquiry in the capital of the empire, as I suspect, would be an indication of the gradually developing role of Constantinople as the chief metropolis for Asia Minor provinces. Nevertheless, the correct address for the request would probably not have *been* the bishop's curia but rather the *synodos endēmousa*, the permanent synod of the bishops in Constantinople who were currently involved in ecclesiastical and church-political business. The Lydian problem could not have been considered particularly serious, perhaps it was dealt with by the secretariat of the permanent synod on the fringes of the sessions (without a secretariat to postulate, this institution of constantly changing composition could not have functioned)? It seems self-evident that the clerics of the hypothetical secretariat were confidants of the bishop.

Bishop Nestorius' confidants *were* the presbyters Anastasius and Photius (p. 96,9 "at the time in the vicinity of the heretic Nestorius"), and with these two names we are back on factual ground; I have speculated about their official duties with Bishop Nestorius, because they must have had a certain degree of authority. In any case, they were familiar with Theodore's text, which was written for such cases of defection, and the name of the author must have become known in Philadelphia, for example, via the emissaries, otherwise Charisius would not have been able to communicate it in Ephesus (see above the letter of Cyril to John of Antioch). In Philadelphia there was no hesitation in presenting or reading the text to the [388] Quartadecimans and the few Novatians; unfortunately there is no corresponding information from the other Lydian episcopal sees. It is astonishing to note in the list of abjurations that

Charisius could not have agitated against ecthesis from the beginning; for the last three names in the list (§ 30-32 in A 76, p.104 f.; the list begins with § 12), all from the rural area around Philadelphia, "call" not only the bishop "an" and the choir bishop responsible for the surrounding area (he too is called Jacob), but also the presbyter and oikonomos Charisius. So when was Charisius excluded from *koinonia* and *leiturgia* and by whom? As he reports at the end of the *Libellus* (before his own confession), the two Constantinople presbyters excluded him at the same time as they recommended the envoy James (p. 97,11-13). According to the list of abjurations, this is a very abbreviated account (and suggests that this list was presented by Charisius in its original form and copied in the same form for the files). But wouldn't the Bishop of Philadelphia have been the first person responsible for an excommunication? And why is his name not mentioned in the referendum or in the *Libellus*?

A number of the abjurers "call" the bishop by name: it is Theophanius. He is still among the living at the time of the Ephesian negotiations: with the help of the indices in ACO I 1,8 he turns out to be a member of the Synod of John of Antioch (p. 19). Now John and his synod had been condemned by the Cyrillic synod a few days before the session of July 22, namely on July 16 and 17 (see the helpful chronological table of dates to be gleaned from the records in ACO I 1,4, p. XXf.). The question of the (discreet?) omission of his name thus arises anew. Had the editing of Charisius' oral report by the Cyrillic Synod, of which I have spoken above, already been carried out before that condemnation?

Since it is rare to learn personal details from the congregations of the time, I would like to share a few observations that can be made from the list of abjurations. As far as the numbers are concerned, it should be remembered that Charisius had reported that "some" of the Lydian "heretics" had wanted to turn to the Catholic Church, so the list will not include all the Quartadecimans and Novatians from the city and surrounding area. However, there are more people on the list than the numbers add up to, as one number includes two names, another three, and six Quartadecimans are added "with their entire houses". Five people are Cathars or Novatians, 19 Quartadecimans. Of these, nine are illiterate and one is "clumsy in writing"; three of the Novatians are illiterate. Secular professions are mentioned three times:

§ 13 *bouleutēs*, § 18 *scholastikos* (lawyer), § 20 *chrysochoos*. It is worth noting that the *scholastikos* is the only one to make a short declaration of refusal and consent; he knows what is necessary for the validity of his step and what is not, so he does not take heavy oaths with numinous content (invoking the Holy Trinity and the *nike* or *eusebeia* of the emperors, possibly also imprecatory formulae for breaking the oath). In three cases the position in the community [389] is indicated: § 16 layman, § 30 (from the surrounding area) *exarchos* of the Quartadecimans (referring to which local area? Designation from outside or self-designation?) § 31

deuteropresbys (one of the illiterates). The illiterates (to whom the not exactly short ekthesis was read) sign through others, who are named in each individual case. The signatories come both from the group of the abjurers themselves (thus the *bouleutēs* twice, once a Novatian for his two comrades) as well as from the receiving community - at least I think that the ecclesiastical degrees mentioned in part belong there, unfortunately only the Anagnostes Neoterius mentions that he is one of the "Orthodox". - Quite a number of the Quartadecimans also give their father's name in the genitive case in addition to their own name; if the father has the same name, there is a *dis* "twice" (I had deduced this application from the inscriptional evidence in Liddell / Scott, Schwartz's Index of Persons confirms this by writing the father's name in the genitive case after the *dis*).

The decision of the Synod (A 77) in the matter of ecthesis, which was presented to the quartadecimans, begins with the words: "Now that this had been read out, the holy Synod decided..." (p. 105,20). Was the entire list of abjurations actually read out? The resolution consists of two parts: First, no one may present or compose a faith other than that decided by the fathers assembled at Nicaea with "the Holy Spirit"; However, this provision is less principled or absolute than it first appears, as the continuation shows that the provision applies to the case of conversion from paganism ("Hellenism"), Judaism or any heresy "to the knowledge of the truth" (lines 22-24); the usual hierarchically graded church punishments are provided for offenders. The second part gives the concrete reason for these more general considerations (p. 106,1-8): If people should be discovered, beginning with bishops, who think or teach like the ecthesis presented by Charisius (for the purpose of accusation, see PGL *prokomizō*) "on the incarnation of the Son of God," then they fall under the judgment of this holy and ecumenical synod, with the appropriate ecclesiastical penalties.

Did this have any subsequent effect on the events in Philadelphia? Are the whole proceedings to be regarded as null and void because they were carried out on the basis of consent to ecthesis?

The reference to the Niceneum in this specific application is reminiscent of Athanasius' procedure towards the Meletians in Antioch in his *Tomus ad Antiochenos*. It could even be a deliberate imitation. At the time, Athanasius had ordered that *only* the Niceneum should be presented for signature to those converting to Nicene orthodoxy, realizing that none of the Meletians would be willing to sign such a Marcellian document as the "Western" Serdicense, as desired by the Old Nicenes, and that any attempt to eliminate the Antiochene schism would therefore fail. He even resorts to the seemingly disloyal means of downgrading the authority of the Serdicense and declaring it irrelevant. - The differences with the procedure used against our Ekthesis in Ephesus [390] are obvious.

Hand. What they have in common is that the sufficiency of the Nicene is a pragmatic and not an absolute one in both cases, even if the Cyrillians in Chalcedon will fiercely resist a new definition with reference to the latter.

With the last pieces of the file complex, the Nestoriusflorileg A 78 from the first session, announced by the editor's insertion in A 77, and the list of documents in A 79, the peculiar composition of actual and fictitious synodal session is maintained to the end. The starting point for the subsequent expansion was presumably the first sentence of *horos* A 77 on the Nicene Creed as the only confession to be used. Schwartz attributes to the editing the "intention" of claiming the "auctoritas generalis" for the individual case of Charisius' motion, as was the case with the deposition of Nestorius (in the first session), and thus to extend the synod's judgment on that ecthesis "to the whole Nestorian doctrine" (I 1,4, p. XVIII), - one must add: all this under the superior authority of the Niceneum. The remark about the "whole Nestorian doctrine" must also be defined more precisely. What is happening here is the condemnation of the Antiochene Christology in its highly revered head Theodore under the name of Nestorius. The fact that the name of the author of the Ekthesis is not mentioned here, although he was known, has tactical reasons, as we know from Cyril himself. This initiated a disastrous development that came to a shameful end with the condemnation of Theodore at the Council of 553.

The unintentionally positive outcome of the meeting of the Cyrillic Synod on July 22, 431 is the inclusion of the ecthesis as a piece of evidence in the text of the acts; we thus have a complete presentation of Theodore's Christo-soteriology with catechetical intent, which we do not have in this form elsewhere.

5.7 Nicenism and Gnosticism in the Rome of Bishop Liberius: the case of Marius Victorinus

Michel Tardieu, Recherches sur la formation de l'Apocalypse de Zostrien et les sources de Marius Victorinus. Pierre Hadot, "Porphyre et Victorinus. Questions et hypothèses, Res Orientales 9, Bures-sur-Yvette 1996 (available from: Peeters Press, Bondgenotenlaan 153, B. P. 41, B-3000 Leuven)1.

The subject of Tardieu's study is the textual parallel between some poorly preserved pages of the "Apocalypse of Zostrianus" (NHC VIII,1) and two chapters in Marius Victorinus. As is well known, "Zostrianus" is one of the titles of Gnostic writings which, until the finds at Nag Hammadi, were only known from Porphyrius' *Vita Plotini* (c. 16). The Christian Gnostic listeners in Plotinus' school encountered the written contradiction of the master; the detailed refutation of the writings listed by name fell to the students: Porphyrius refuted "Zoroaster", Amelius "Zostrianus", characteristically in forty *biblia*.

"Histoire d'une découverte" (pp. 9-17) is the title of the first chapter of the volume, in which Tardieu first gives a brief overview of the history of research concerning both Marius Victorinus and the Coptic "Zostrianus" (pp. 9-15a), and then describes the individual steps of the discovery (pp. 15a-17) - an exciting, accelerating process, in which one can still sense the enthusiasm of those involved as one reads. Incidentally, the decisive observation that set the ball rolling is due to Hadot's attention.

For Tardieu, the whole thing began with Amelius, namely in his brief lecture on the prologue of the Gospel of John, as quoted by Euseb in the *Praeparatio evangelica* XI 19,1, but without specifying the title of Amelius' [514] writing. Luc Brisson in his monograph on Amelius² presumably wanted to attribute the quotation to the otherwise not preserved refutation of "Zostrianus"³. Brisson describes Amelius' lecture as a "commentary" on John 14; Heinrich Dörrie, in his essay on the quotation⁵, speaks of "a Neoplatonic exegesis" (title),

¹ I only received the book for review in 2000. - Tardieu wrote the Löwen part of this volume, pages 9-113; Hadot's contribution, rightly given as a separate title, is on pages 117-125. Hadot also wrote Remarques additionnelles on some points of the Treatise written by Tardieu, p. 113 f. The asterisks on pages 96a, 100b, 110a, 112b refer to Hadot's remarques. - Because of the large format, the book is printed in two columns; where u s e f u l, I have marked the columns.

² L. Brisson, Amélius. Sa vie, son œuvre, sa doctrine, son style, ANRW II 36,2, Berlin / New York 1987, 793-860.

³ Ibid. 824 below.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ H. Dörrie, Une exégèse néoplatonicienne du prologue de l'évangile de saint Jean (Amélius chez Eusebe, Prép. Év. 11,19,1-4), in: J. Fontaine/Ch. Kannengiesser (eds.), Epektasis, FS Jean Daniélou, Paris

even of "toute une réinterprétation des sentences célèbres" of the prologue⁶. On rereading Dörrie's essay, I find his results untenable; since they have been taken over by Brisson, I am organizing a digression on the quotation and its interpretation here.

Dörrie begins (75) with Augustin's statement, civ. X 29 end (Book X is entirely devoted to the debate with Porphyrius), which he has heard several times (*solebamus audire*, says Augustin), that a certain Platonist had said that the beginning of the Gospel of John should be placed in a prominent position in all churches, in golden letters. This sentence can only have been understood by both Simplician and Augustin in a positive sense as a statement favorable to Christians. Because of the tradent Simplician, one could suspect Marius Victorinus in the *quidam platonicus*. Dörrie would probably prefer to see Amelius in this figure, but this is "too daring" (83). Dörrie wants to recognize a completely different intention in the Platonist's statement than the obvious one, namely that of a sophisticated undermining of Christianity. The Platonist certainly did not want to propagate the Gospel; rather, the teaching expressed in the prologue is purely Platonic, i.e. hostile to Christianity. If it were correctly understood by Christians, it would lead to the disintegration of Christianity (75, similar to 79 above). The Platonist and Amelius both hoped to attack Christian theology with the help of John's prologue. In their opinion, the prologue contained the complete definition of the second hypostasis (83, cf. also 82 at note 34). The Logos, of which Amelius speaks using the prologue, is identical with the world-soul (76. 78. 79). The world-soul is thus counted here by Dörrie as a *second* hypostasis; this presupposes the material classification of Amelius' quotation from Euseb (see below), which Dörrie does not say. He gives his justification in 82 note 34: "Évidemment, la deuxième hypostase est rattachée par le Logos à la première, le Noûs, qui est l'être pur; d'autre part, aucune âme n'existera à l'écart du Logos. On remarque bien toute la [515] complexité de l'ontologie plotinienne" (emphasis mine). This remark by Dörrie will compel Brisson to take a "detour" via Plotinus in his treatment of the Amelius excerpt in the sense of Dörrie; Dörrie calls the intention of the two Platonists that he discovered a "proposition curieuse", which can be explained by the well-known subtlety of these philosophers (75). Now no one doubts the hostility to Christianity of such famous Platonists as Celsus, Porphyrius and the Emperor Julian; but with the best will in the world I am unable to see in the two texts examined here by Dörrie any evidence for the special interpretation of the Logos doctrine of John's prologue that undermines Christianity; to recognize Amelius' disparaging opinion of the Incarnation,

1972, 75-87, reprinted in: H. Dörrie, *Platonica minora*, Munich 1976, 491-507. I quote here from Epektasis.

⁶ Ibid. 76.

there is no need for subtlety. The "proposition curieuse" is therefore Dörrie's and not that of these short texts. However, this says nothing about the fundamental compatibility or incompatibility of (New) Platonism and Christianity; it is known that Dörrie was convinced of their incompatibility.

In Brisson's work, the section on the world soul in Amelius (840-843) is based entirely on Dörrie. In part 5 ("Doctrine", 830) we find "L'Âme" (836), "Le nom de l'Âme" (837), "Le domaine de l'Âme" and finally "L'Âme du monde" (840-843). As already mentioned, Brisson begins the section on the soul with the observation that one must take a detour via Plotinus. As far as the relationship between logos and soul is concerned, Amelius' opinion seems to coincide with that of the master (836). Provided that one accepts the hypothesis of the identity of Logos and world-soul in Amelius' quotation, then Amelius' doctrine of the world-soul could be partially reconstructed from his commentary on the Prologue to John (840).

In the text of Amelius, of course, there is no evidence for the hypothesis that the world soul is being discussed here, just as little as in the broader context of Euseb. Dörrie (78) has quite correctly deduced from the beginning of the quotation (καὶ οὗτος ἄρα ἦν ὁ λόγος) that an investigation into the nature of the Logos must have preceded our passage and that Amelius had reached a result which he finds again in the two authors he quotes, Heraclitus and the Evangelist. However, Amelius presents John as an anonymous *barbaros*. Incidentally, the last sentence of Amelius' speech goes beyond the prologue. As far as Amelius' judgment of what he has said is concerned, if it is not already clear from the speech itself (see above), we would probably have to look for it in the continuation of the original text, but Euseb has not handed it down to us.

In any case, Euseb *does not* see the world-soul in the Logos. Euseb's line of argument is easy to survey on the basis of the (secondary) headings: "That God alone is One" (XI 13); "On the Second Cause" (XI 14), namely after Philo (15), Plato (16), Plotinus (17), Numenius (18). Amelius is given his own heading (19). Euseb gives [516] the "barbarian" his correct name before and after the quotation. After quoting Col 1:15 as the statement of "another Hebrew theologian", Euseb explains that there is agreement between Greeks and "Hebrews" regarding the "second cause" (19:5). Μετίωμεν δῆτα καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέρα, he announces; the next topic, according to the heading, is the "three initial hypostases" (XI 20), of which the world soul is the *third*. Unlike the second, there is the difference here that the "Hebrews" place the Holy Spirit in the third position (20:1). Those "experienced" in Plato's explanation interpret the famous passage from Plato's second letter in terms of the first God, the second causal agent and the third, namely the world soul; they also define the latter as the "third God". "The divine λόγοι", however, speaks of the τριάς of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Euseb does not elaborate on the difference with regard to the third divine, but announces the "essence of good" (20:3) as the next topic.

In the following I provide individual comments on the text of Amelius, partly in discussion with Dörrie.

καὶ οὗτος ἄρα ἦν ὁ λόγος καθ' ὃν αἰεὶ ὄντα τὰ γινόμενα ἐγίνετο, ὡς καὶ ὁ Ἡράκλειτος ἀξιῶσκει καὶ νῆ Δί' ὃν ὁ βάρβαρος ἀξιοῖ ἐν τῇ τῆς ἀρχῆς τάξει τε καὶ ἀξία καθεστηκότα πρὸς θεὸν εἶναι καὶ θεὸν εἶναι. δι' οὗ πάνθ' ἀπλῶς γεγενῆσθαι, ἐν ᾧ τὸ γενόμενον ζῶν καὶ ζῶν καὶ ὃν πεφυκέναι. καὶ εἰς τὰ σώματα πίπτειν καὶ σάρκα ἐνδυσάμενον φαντάζεσθαι ἄνθρωπον μετὰ τοῦ καὶ τηνικαῦτα δεικνύειν τῆς φύσεως τὸ μεγαλεῖον. ἀμέλει καὶ ἀναλυθέντα πάλιν ἀποθεοῦσθαι καὶ θεὸν εἶναι, οἷος ἦν πρὸ τοῦ εἰς τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον καταχθῆναι.

"And this, then, was the Logos, in relation to *whom*, always being, the thing that has become came into being, as Heraclitus also would have thought it right to say, and of whom, with Zeus, the barbarian thinks it right to say, that he who is in the order and dignity of principle is towards God and is God, that through him par excellence all things have become; that in him that which has become is alive and living and existing; and that he falls into the bodies and appears clothed with flesh as man, that he thereby at the same time shows the glory of nature; finally, that even that which has been destroyed is again deified and is God, which he was before he descended into the body and the flesh and man".

The interjection νῆ Δία, "with Zeus", translated by Dörrie 78 as "parbleu", underlines the affirmation that follows, after the reference to Heraclitus in the *Potentialis* (ibid.). It is extremely rare for a philosophical text to be interrupted by an expression of this kind; one is normally careful not to use emotions in the treatment of philosophical subjects. The rare exceptions always mark a "point de culmination", which is obviously true of this passage (78 note 12, taken from Brisson in his section on the style of Amelius, 853 f.). One wonders what emotion is being expressed here - astonishment?

[517] Both specialists rightly find the transformation of the definition ἐν ἀρχῇ from John 1:1 to ἐν τῇ τῆς ἀρχῆς τάξει τε καὶ ἀξία remarkable - the Logos is appreciated by the *barbaros*. The logos is (καθεστηκότα) "in the order and dignity of the ἀρχή". Ἀρχή therefore does not mean "beginning" in the temporal sense, but rather "principle". The ἀρχή is God, which is the conclusion that Amelius draws from the Johannine predications πρὸς τὸν θεόν and θεός for the Logos.

John 1:3 is summarized: "Through him all things have become"; already at the beginning, before Heraclitus was mentioned, it was said "of the ever-being Logos" that καθ' ὃν "became what has become".

A characteristic extension is offered for ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν from John 1:4. Dörrie 79: The term "life" is explained by the sequence ζῶν - ζωή - ὄν, i.e. by a gradation in which "la valeur ontologique s'accroît à chaque degré". One can see the philosopher's particular interest in this ontological explanation, which emphasizes the power and the "actualité" of the Logos (which Dörrie explicitly identifies with the world soul at this point).

Dörrie finds the following statements by Amelius "much less interesting" (79). I cannot agree with this. With John 1:14 ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, Amelius proceeds in such a way that he does not quote this colon literally (he only retains σὰρξ), but transmits it by amplification. The first colon of his transmission contains a pejorative evaluation: καὶ εἰς σώματα πίπτειν. The next colon καὶ σάρκα ἐνδυσάμενον is not conspicuous on its own, rather the verbs of "to put on" and "to put on" are not conspicuous.

"wearing" of body/flesh by the Logos is quite common in Christianity. Dörrie, on the other hand, in keeping with the style of his interpretation, recalls (79 note 23) that the metaphor of the soul being clothed with the body on entering this life is richly varied, the vocabulary corresponding entirely to the traditions of the Πλατωνικοί.

The last of the three colas, φαντάζεσθαι ἄνθρωπον, "he appears as man", reveals the docetic conception of the incarnation by Amelius or his guarantors. Brisson's proposal to regard the exegesis of Amelius as belonging to the refutation of "Zostrianus" is derived from this docetic passage (842). I consider Brisson's assumption to be superfluous (although it had an unexpected effect, see below): If Amelius took such an interest in the Prologue to John that he used it in writing, he was also in a position to ask around how it was understood by the "barbarians", be they Church Christians or Christian Gnostics.

Dörrie (81) and, following him, Brisson (842) claim that the continuation in Amelius, μετὰ τοῦ καὶ τηνικαῦτα δεικνύειν τῆς φύσεως μεγαλεῖον, has no equivalent in the Gospel text. But the sentence is nothing other than the rendering of another colon from John 1:14, namely καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. "The greatness of nature (sc. of the Logos)" is the translation of δόξα, which for philosophical readers only meant "opinion" or the like.

[518] As already mentioned, Amelius' last sentence can no longer be derived from John's prologue, but must be based on information about Christian doctrine that Amelius has obtained. Ἀμέλει at the beginning of the sentence is translated by Brisson (841) as "évidemment", whereas Dörrie favors "nothing special", "one need not be surprised" or the like (81) and considers this expression to be for the Christians.

"shocking", an over-interpretation entirely in line with his overall view. A modest "finally" will suffice.

With ἀναλυθέντα (Dörrie 81: "the Logos will again *separate* itself from its earthly bond" 7, Brisson in translation 841: "once destroyed") it is probably permissible to think of John 2:19.21. Verse 19 Christ: λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, "demolish this temple", verse 21 of the evangelist: "But he spoke of the temple of his body". However, Amelius makes no mention of the rebuilding of this temple, i.e. the resurrection of the body.

7 My emphasis.

was before. It is remarkable that from the previous descent into "body", "flesh", "man" is used, thus incorporating the three keywords from the description of the incarnation. Their synonymity reveals knowledge of the variable Christian use of language in this respect. The mere enumeration in the last sentence of Amelius seems rather arid and mechanical. Andrew Smith points out in his contribution "Porphyrian Studies since 1913"⁸ in a note⁹ on F. Börtzler¹⁰, "(who) argues that Eusebius, though exact in his citations, often omits phrases or severely shortens passages". I read the note in Smith after writing the foregoing; Börtzler's observation made immediate sense to me as applicable to our text, not merely to the final sequence. In the absence of a textual parallel, I cannot prove my intuition, but given the known breadth in Amelius' accounts, which Porphyrius reports with a slight sneer, it may be considered plausible.

Tardieu tried to establish a connection between the Amelius quotation and "Zostrianus" from the other side, namely from the Gnostic scriptures, in order to support Brisson's proposal. In his thorough study "Les gnostiques dans la *Vie de Plotinus*. Analyse de chapitre 16"¹¹, Tardieu used two passages he had reconstructed from "Zostrianus" which, in his opinion, allowed "de corroborer sur un fait textuel l'hypothèse de Brisson"¹². Tardieu included the corresponding passage¹³ in the section "Histoire d'une découverte", omitting the words or quotations written in Coptic, from his and Hadot's pen (pp. 15 f.):

"Dans la métaphysique du *Zostrien*, le premier principe est identifié à l'esprit (*pneuma*) et porte son nom. It is 'l'Esprit invisible' (58:16-17 [of the Coptic text]), l'Esprit trois fois puissant et invisible' (87:13-14). Les modalités de cette triple puissance de l'Esprit, qui est le Père, s'énoncent, comme dans d'autres traités gnostiques, à l'aide de spéculations sur la triade: existence (*hyparxis*), vie (*onh*, *zoe*) et science (*episteme*), appelée aussi 'béatitude de la connaissance', où 'perfection' cognitive, autrement dit la pensée. Or, in *Zostrien*, the Logos johannique sert de prédicat à l'hyparxis paternelle, ainsi que le montrent les deux fragments suivants qui sont une exégèse visiblement polémique du premier verset du prologue.

66,18-21 (texte copte) 'Et en tant que dans l'existence, il (= le Père-Esprit) est commencement absolu, logos de lui-même et forme (eidos = idea) de lui-même'.

⁸ A. Smith, *Porphyrian Studies since 1913*, ANRW II 36,2, Berlin/New York 1987, 719-773.

⁹ Ibid. 743 note 146.

¹⁰ F. Börtzler, *Porphyrios' Schrift von den Götterbildern*, Diss. Erlangen 1903, 12. 16-17.

¹¹ In: L. Brisson et alii (eds.), *Porphyre. La vie de Plotinus II*, Paris 1992, 503-563.

¹² Ibid. 539.

¹³ Ibid. 539 f.

78,10-16 (texte copte) 'Par acte, puissance et substance, elle (l'hyparxis) n'a pas eu à commencer avec le temps mais se manifesta éternellement, se tenant (ou: immo- bile) auprès de lui (= l'Esprit) éternellement'.

Since then, while the Johannine Logos is identical to the personalized saga of the Jewish tradition (Prov 8:30: 'J'étais auprès de lui'), this Logos can, from the point of view of the author of *Zostrien*, only designate the form of existence prior to the first principle, and not the form of the Fils. En repérant l'autorité scripturaire utilisée par le *Zostrien* et en proposant une paraphrase rectificatrice, Amélius aura soin de montrer l'inanité des deux interprétations du prologue chez ses adversaires: le Logos johannique ne saurait s'appliquer ni au principe premier (position du *Zostrien*) ni au second (thèse de *polloi* [i.e. of the church Christians]). i.e. of the church Christians]), but seulement, du point de vue d'un néoplatonicien, à la troisième hypostase, c'est-à-dire, ainsi que cela a été bien expliqué par Brisson, à l'âme du monde."

We notice in this passage that the name of Dörrie as the originator of the opinion that the Johannine Logos in Amelius is the world-soul is no longer mentioned (unlike in Brisson). Furthermore, the world-soul is counted as the third hypostasis; the ad hoc counting introduced by Dörrie (because of the Eusebian context) as the *second hypostasis after the nous* has been eliminated. I have explained above that the identification of logos and world-soul cannot be inferred from Amelius' text and that Euseb did not find it in it. So, contrary to what Tardieu would like, Amelius does not correct the understanding of the πολλοί with regard to the position of the Logos in relation to the Father ("principle" in Amelius). Even if the two Coptic quotations, as juxtaposed above by Tardieu, were to refer to John 1:1, or could at least suggest this, there is no indication of a second polemical direction in Amelius' comparatively [520] downright factual presentation of the prologue, any more than there is for the first. After the next and decisive step in the assessment of the Zostrianus quotations, which we will discuss shortly, the relationship to Amelius and also to the Prologue to John disappears tacitly from Tardieu's investigation, because now the actual literary connections become clear. But Brisson's and Tardieu's tentative experimental arrangements have allowed an element to emerge in the first of the two quotations from "Zostrianus" that would not have been seen without Tardieu's reconstruction and translation¹⁴.

Hadot quoted Tardieu's passage above in the first version read with the Coptic quotations and in the formulation "Logos of himself" "une citation littérale de Victorinus". It was immediately recognizable to him because he had found it in Victorinus as a "véritable hapax legomenon de la philosophie" (Tardieu/Hadot p. 15). Hadot compared the surroundings of the Zostrianus passage containing the phrase, i.e. NHC VIII,1, 64-67, with sections 49 and 50

¹⁴ For the translation of the critical passages in Sieber and Layton, see Tardieu/Hadot p. 16.

of Victorinus' *Adversus Arium* I and gained the impression that they were real parallels (Tardieu/Hadot p. 16). Tardieu produced a synopsis between the two sources (with a French translation of the Coptic) and a critical edition of the corresponding pages from "Zostrianus". The considerable losses of text could be supplemented on the basis of the Latin parallels. The Coptic manuscript is offered in photographic reproduction for some of the pages (NHC VIII,1, 64.65.66.75); reconstructed and translated are 64-68; 75; 84 lines 18-22; 74 lines 8-21 (in this order).

Corrections to Tardieu's reconstruction of the Coptic text are contained in the reviews that have come to my attention so far¹⁵. There are four, the first of which I have not yet had access to: by Birger A. Pearson, Ph. Luisier¹⁶, Hans-Martin Schenke¹⁷ and Uwe Karsten Plisch¹⁸. Schenke (254a) was able to use as an "internal working paper" what Plisch (633 note 2) already had in print: W.-P. Funk, *Concordance des textes de Nag Hammadi. Les Codices VIII et IX, Sainte-Foy and Louvain-Paris 1997*. Schenke (254a/b) makes suggestions regarding NHC VIII,1, 64,18 f. Luisier (212): The first two words of 64,24 (line 23 at Tardieu 35 and 49) "correspond very well to the 'definitum' of Latin, quelque chose comme πεπερασμένον en grec (instead of "accessible" Tardieu). [521] On 65,4-7 see Schenke 254b and Plisch 633 (Funk). On 65:10-15, see Schenke 254b and Plisch 633 f. (Funk). On 66:3 f. see Schenke 254bf., Plisch 634 (Funk). Luisier 212: "Que faire de M[EN en 66,5?" On 66,9-13 see Schenke 255a (partly Funk); his or Funk's reconstruction of line 12 does not seem possible to me in terms of content (I can only judge from the translation): "from which the truly existing spirit originates" (instead of Tardieu "qui procèdent de l'Esprit véritablement existant" p. 38b); cf. Tardieu p. 62a on the relationship between spirit and the "truly existing". The words in question are a surplus to the Latin parallel, so that there is no possibility of control. On 66.19 f. Schenke's reconstruction (255a) yields: "He exists by being something simple" = "he is something simple", cf. Plisch 634 (Funk). On 66.22 f. Luisier 212 criticizes the incorrect rendering of the causative infinitive. Schenke 255b takes a somewhat broader view of the fragment, namely lines 22-25; his reconstruction and translation of 66,22-25 (255b), with the omission of Tardieu's "distinguer" (Tardieu/Hadot p. 39 and p. 53), naturally also drops the relationship to Numenius, fragment 11, established by Tardieu (ibid. p. 39) (fragment 11 will, however, be of some use to us later for a quotation from Marius Victorinus). Schenke recognizes 255b as the *thought* of 66,22-25: "The one who has allowed himself to be found causes the one who has sought him to come to true being"; *translation*: "And the one whom he will seek causes him to come to true being".

¹⁵ I would like to thank Dr. Mechthild Kellermann for her kind bibliographical and library assistance.

¹⁶ OCP 64, 1998, 211-213. On the asterisci, which appear puzzling to Luisier (213), see note 1 above.

¹⁷ JbAC 41, 1998, 252-256.

¹⁸ OLZ 93, 1998, 631-634.

becomes a being. But in vitality he is alive". On 67,8: Plisch 634 sees a grammatical inadmissibility; Schenke discusses lines 7-10 (255b). Using Funk's reconstruction of lines 7 (second half) and 8, he arrives at the translation "except what belongs to him alone". On 67.21 f. Plisch 634 again observes a grammatical inadmissibility. Based on Funk, Schenke 255bf. translates line 22 as "and an inhabitant" (*habitor*). Schenke (256a) and Plisch (634) also criticize 68.7 f. on grammatical grounds; Schenke wants to stick with Funk for the time being.

At the beginning of the first chapter of Tardieu/Hadot, Tardieu gives a brief overview of the research into the Neoplatonic references in Marius Victorinus (pp. 9 f.), which extends from P. Henry to P. Hadot and signifies the transition from Plotinus to Porphyrius as the main point of reference. In his commentary (SC 69)¹⁹ Hadot had not limited the search for the lost (Greek) sources of Victorinus to the pagan philosophers, but also included the Gnostic literature. "Since this aspect does not appear in the indices of the commentary volume", Tardieu compiles a list of such topics and passages (10 f.). The astonishing thing about this material is the impartiality with which Victorinus uses it: He does not attack the ideas in question, he [522] does not behave apologetically - he is apparently not even aware that we are dealing with what may be disputable, and this despite a condemnation of Valentin at one point²⁰. At the end of our volume Hadot says (Tardieu/Hadot p. 125b): "Tout cet aspect 'gnostique' de Victorinus reste un problème inexpliqué".

I am of the opinion that a topos that appears several times in Victorinus must also belong to this strange complex. These are statements about the sufferings of the Logos that do not only concern the Incarnation. I first noticed such a statement years ago in the overlong confession that Victorinus presents in c. 47 of adv. Ar. I²¹. I am quoting this text here in full in structured form. In the commentary on adv. ar. I 47 in SC 69 (835-838), Hadot gives "la structure générale", essentially the traditional Christian key words in a long list, and references to the points of contact with the contemporary confessions. The lines we are interested in here are not visible. Various phrases are discussed by Hadot in the individual explanations; most important for us are the cross-references to parallel passages in Victorinus, of which I will make use below. In order not to clash with the line count of the edition²²

¹⁹ Marius Victorinus, *Traité théologique sur la Trinité II*, Commentaire par Pierre Hadot, SC 69, Paris 1960.

²⁰ See below on Tardieu p. 111bf. [here in this volume p. 443].

²¹ The text fills the whole of chapter 47.

²² The line count for each chapter is identical for the edition of the text by Henry/Hadot in SC 68, 1960, and in CSEL 83, 1971, as well as for the German translation by Hadot/Brenke 1967. The page numbers can therefore be largely omitted.

I count the lines of meaning with letters; the length of the Credo requires a second pass through the alphabet, then with double letters²³.

Marius Victorinus, *adversus Arium* I 47

- a) *Confitemur igitur deum patrem omnipotentem,*
- b) *confitemur filium unigenitum Jesum Christum,*
- c) *deum de deo,*
- d) *lumen verum de vero lumine,*
- e) *formam dei,*
- f) *qui habet substantiam de dei substantia,*
- g) *natura, generatione filium,*
- h) *simul cum patre consubstantiatum, quod Graeci ὁμοούσιον appellant,*
- i) *primogenitum ante constitutionem mundi et primogenitum ante omnem creaturam,*
- j) *hoc est et ante in substantiam²⁴ veniendi et regenerationis et revivendi et reviviscendi,*
- [523] k) *primogenitum a mortuis,*
- l) *λόγον qui sit omnium universalis λόγος,*
- m) *λόγον autem ad deum,*
- n) *λόγον in postremis temporibus incarnatum et cruce vincentem mortem et omne peccatum,*
- o) *salvatorem nostrum,*
- p) *iudicem omnium,*
- q) *semper cum patre consubstantialem et ὁμοούσιον,*
- r) *potentiam activam a patria potentia et generantem et facientem omnia,*
- s) *et substantiam existendi omnium et generationem et reviviscentiam,*
- t) *quoniam vita est aeterna et dei virtus et sapientia,*
- u) *ipsum inversibilem, ininmutabilem iuxta quod λόγος est et quod semper λόγος est,*
- w)²⁵ *iuxta autem quod est creare omnia et maxime iuxta in hyle actionem impassibiliter patientem,*
- x) *ut fons aquarum, inmutabilis, impassibilis, extra omnem motionem,*
- y) *cum fluit et in flumen advenit, iuxta alveum et genera et qualitates terrae creditur pati,*
- z) *semper servans potentiam aquae suae et sicuti flumen irrigat terram nullam deminutionem sentiens, ad hoc quod est esse aquam,*

²³ I will not repeat the proof of biblical passages here.

²⁴ This *substantia* cannot be any other than that of line s, which the Logos "makes", lines rs. One would actually expect some qualification for the purpose of distinguishing it from the *substantia* of God (line f), the absolute use is astonishing.

²⁵ I had originally assigned the number v to the second half of line u, but this was not correct. is. v therefore disappears.

- aa) *sic Christus ille est fluuius, de quo propheta dicit: qui irrigat et infundit totam terram.*
 - bb) *Sed Christus totum omne irrigat et visibilia et invisibilia,*
 - cc) *flumine vitae omnem, eorum quae sunt, substantiam rigat.*
 - dd) *In quo autem vita, est Christus,*
 - ee) *in quo rigat, sanctus spiritus,*
 - ff) *in quo potentia est vitalitatis, pater et deus,*
 - gg) *totum autem unus deus.*
 - hh) *Confitemur ergo et sanctum spiritum ex deo patre omnia habentem,*
 - ii) *τῷ λόγῳ hoc est Jesu Christo tradente illi omnia, quae Christus habet a patre.*
 - jj) *Et isto huius modi modo²⁶ et simul confitemur esse haec tria et isto quod unum et unum deum et ὁμοούσια ista et semper simul et patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum,*
 - kk) *ineffabili potentia et ineloquibili generatione filium dei Jesum Christum,*
 - ll) *λόγος qui sit ad deum*
 - mm) *et imaginem et formam et characterem et refulgentiam patris et virtutem et sapien- tiam dei,*
 - [524] nn) *per quae appareat et declaratur deus in potentia omnium*
 - oo) *et existens et manens et agens omnia secundum actionem filii, id est τοῦ λόγου of Jesus Christ,*
 - pp) *quem incarnatum et crucifixum et resurgentem a mortuis*
 - qq) *et ascendentem in caelos et sedentem ad dexteram patris et iudicem futurum venire et viventium et mortuorum,*
 - rr) *patrem²⁷ omnis creaturae et salvatorem*
 - ss) *et voce et toto corde confitemur semper. Ἀμήν.*
- Gratia et pax a deo patre et filio eius Jesu Christo domino nostro, sic ista confitenti in omnia saeculi saeculorum.*

Unclear as the Confession is and wordy, in the style of Victorinus' other theological prose (how different the hymns!), it must nevertheless be assumed that everything contained in it was important enough to the author to be included in this summary, including the section w. x. y, more precisely u-z. It is no wonder that Hadot only mentions the beginning of x in his schematism (*ut fons aquarum...*). In fact, as far as I can see, there is no *confessio fidei* that contains statements of this kind about the suffering of the Logos. This makes our text a singular phenomenon within its genre. But is there any other

²⁶ *isto huius modi modo* seems to be an attempt to render ὡσαύτως. Cf. Lc 22,20 ὡσαύτως in the Luther Bible even now: "of the same kind" - just as awkward.

²⁷ Hadot (SC 69, 838) refers to Ad. Candid. 18,5, where we find: *Pater ergo omnium et generator λόγος.*

"orthodox" theologian who could speak about the Logos in this way? (Not to mention the philosophers).

The sense lines u-z carefully alternate between the immutability of the Logos or water (u, x, z) and their "suffering" (w and y). In the commentary on xy²⁸ Hadot rightly says that the comparison with the river is traditional, as is the distinction between spring and river. It must be added, however, that the metaphor otherwise serves to illustrate the unity and difference of Father and Son in the Trinity, whereas Victorinus here wants to make it clear why the Logos is always unchanging Logos, but on the other hand "suffers" in his creative activity without "diminishing" his Logoshood. The fact that the Logos always remains what it is and yet suffers with regard to its creative activity (and even more so as incarnate) leads to the statement of the "suffering incapable of suffering" (end of w), i.e. a limitation or relativization with regard to suffering, a paradox with regard to the ἀπάθεια (*impassibiliter patiens*) could also be said by other theologians who do not exhibit the peculiarities of Victorinus with regard to the suffering of the *incarnate*). The same relativization also applies to water: flowing water is "assumed to suffer" (*creditur pati*, y), depending on the state of the riverbed over which it glides. The motif [525] of motionlessness and flow (x at the end, y at the beginning), i.e. movement in our passage referring only to spring and river, appears elsewhere in Victorinus in the realm of the divine. "Without reduction", said in reference to the being of water, can of course also be applied to the Logos, as I have just done.

The parallel passages resulting from Hadot's multiple cross-references are arranged as follows: Adv. Ar. I 17:35; 22:47-51; 24:16; 32:57-78; 40:19-23; 44:36-38; 45:1-3; (IV 11:8 contains only one mention of *hylica*); "et surtout" 29 IV 31:31-53.

Marius Victorinus, adv. ar. I 17,32-37. *Una igitur substantia quia idem spiritus, sed idem in tribus; ὁμοούσιον igitur. Unde non similis³⁰ substantia, quia idem spiritus. Nec tamen idcirco passionem eadem (as in Son and Holy Spirit) et in patre, quia unus spiritus. In duobus enim tantum velut passionem, quia iam progressi spiritus (plur.!) sunt.* On the sufferings of the Son and the Spirit, see Hadot's commentary on I 16,23 on the

"intérieurité réciproque" of Son and Spirit and the conception of Victorinus "d'une unité de mouvement entre le Fils et l'Esprit-Saint" ³¹. See also the reference ³² to I 28,5 (2-7) Suffering and Movement: Jesus is God, Son by nature, Son in the flesh ... *et quod ipse passus sit, qui secundum motionem, pater autem non, secundum cessationem*

²⁸ SC 69, 837 to adv. ar. I 47,16-26.

²⁹ As in note 28.

³⁰ = ὁμοιος, and that is too little!

³¹ SC 69, 756.

³² I seem not to have noted *where* Hadot gives the cross-reference.

("repos"). - The relativizing *velut passiones* of 17.36 (see above) agrees with the *creditur pati*, § y in the Confession.

Adv. ar. I 22,40-51: *Universalis enim λόγος* (cf. in the Confession § I) *filius dei est cuius potentia proveniunt et procedunt in generationem omnia et consistunt. Ipsius ergo potentia procedens et simul existens cum patre, facit omnia et generat. Et ipsa haec potentia, in eo quod est ei praecedere (= procedere), quae quidem actio dicitur, ipsa patitur, si quid patitur* (cf. above *velut passiones*), *iuxta materias et substantias, quibus praestat proprium ad id quod est illis esse ... qui semper est ad patrem et ὁμοούσιος. Et idcirco de filio dicitur quod et impassibilis et passibilis* (see in the Confession § w), *sed in progressu ("procession") passio, maxime autem in extremo progressionis, hoc est cum fuit in carne.* - On this³³ as on other passages in Victorinus, Hadot points out that Victorinus, against the accusation of patripassianism, which the opposing party raises against the homoousia of Father and Son, places the suffering in the activity of the Logos. - "Patripassianism" is a dirty word for the teaching of those who identify the Son with the Father (the monarchians); this identification must necessarily result in the suffering of the Father. But as far as one can see, this always refers to the suffering on the cross and the death of Jesus. [526] Victorinus' extension of the realm of suffering into the pre-existence of the Logos is intended to serve the intra-Trinitarian relief of the Father from suffering. At the same time, however, Victorinus shows a tendency to declare the sufferings of the Creator Logos to be inauthentic, see above *si quid patitur* (22,45) as well as the other relativizations already observed. These will be joined by others (as in the very next quotation), and I leave their perception to the reader's attention.

Adv. Ar. I 24,13-18: *Rursus quod filius λόγος est, in actionem festinans substantia* ("substance s'élançant vers l'acte"), *vita enim λόγος et intellegentia, λόγος processit in substantiam* ("s'est avancé pour donner substance") *eorum quae sunt et intellectibilibus et hylicorum. Et idcirco actio ipsius τοῦ λόγου propter imbecillitatem percipientium ipsum* ("à cause de la faiblesse de ceux qui le reçoivent") *et patitur et passibilis est vel potius passibilis dicitur.*

Adv. Ar. I 32,57-78 deals with "the problem of the external act of life and intelligence" on the anthropological level, i.e. in the realm of the soul. Hadot describes the analogies and differences to the doctrine of the Trinity³⁴. I only note here the definition of movement as "suffering", line 61: *Motio enim passio et motione passio*; line 64: *Motione igitur omnis passio.*

Adv. Ar. I 40 serves the exegesis of 1 Cor. 1:24: Christ God's wisdom and power. In the context of his treatise, Victorinus has to deal with the correct interpretation of the genitive Θεοῦ in this colon. Lines 26-32: *(Deus/pater) gignit enim ista in actionem et impassibiliter quod ὁμοούσια sunt potentia et actio et deus et dei virtus et*

³³ SC 69, 773 to adv. ar. I 22,44-55.

³⁴ SC 69, 805.

sapientia. Quae cum activa sunt, iuxta ea quae foris sunt curam habentia ad deum sunt, semper sapientiam dantia, semper vivificantia, non deum sed a deo factam per semet ipsa omnem creaturam. Et si qua passio, in actione passio est. - I have quoted the whole passage only because of the short sentence about "suffering" at its end. I find it remarkable that Victorinus considers such a sentence necessary here at all.

The chapter directed against the Patripassians adv. Ar. I 44 (with the beginning of 45) for the time being and draw on the passage adv. Ar. IV 31,31-53. Victorinus begins with the renewed establishment of distinction and unity in God: *Alter pater, alter filius*; here now follows the image of spring and river in the traditional application, line 34 f.: *Pater filii fons, filius ut flumen quod excurrit ex fonte.* 35 f.: In the spring the water is pure and calm, 37-40: *sibi occulto motu plenitudinem suam suggerens; item ut flumen motu apertiore per diversa discurrens, terrarum quas sulcat qualitatibus et adfcitur et quodammodo patitur* (cf. in Confession § y), 40-53: So also the Son is pure according to his substance, which is that of the Father, [527] incapable of suffering etc..., *regionibus per quas discurrit locisque vel supracaelestibus vel caelestibus vel intracaelestibus*³⁵ *nunc spumat ut occurrentibus saxis quae sunt ex generibus animarum, <nunc> campis quietus excurrit - recipit igitur passiones, non in eo quod substantia est, sed in actu aque operatione. Nam cum myste- rium adventus sui compleret, tum iam passionem sustinuit, ut se exinaniret ut personam servi susciperet. Sic et reliqua, in quibus omnibus actus est et operatio, quamquam et in primo existentiae suae actu, sicuti in multis libris docuimus, passio extiterit recessionis a patre; unde et tenebrae, id est hyle, consecuta est, non creata. Sed haec plenius alibi.* - For line 36 Hadot cites Plotinus Enn. III 8,10,7: *πηγή ... μένουσαν αὐτὴν ἡσύχως.* With regard to lines 40-45, Hadot recalls *Oracula chaldaica* no. 37 (in des Places, while Hadot is still quoting from Kroll), line 10 of which speaks of the "ideas that break themselves on the bodies of the world". Des Places, for his part, can already quote Hadot's reference and our passage with the river/son "foaming" over the encountered rocks - in lines 47-52, the suffering of the son is enumerated in retrograde order: Completion of the mystery of his coming (i.e. the death on the cross); even before that, the divestment of Phil 2 and the assumption of the *persona servi*; and at the very beginning, the first *actus* of his existence, the *recessio* from the Father. As far as Phil 2 is concerned, it is striking that Victorinus translates *μορφή* with *persona* and not, as would seem obvious, with *forma*. The same Victorinus avoids (as the only one in the West³⁶) the use of *persona* in the doctrine of the Trinity, indeed he explicitly rejects it. What might he have understood by *persona* at this point? Hadot and Hadot/Brenke translate as if it were *forma*. Of greatest interest are the lines

³⁵ *intra* can also mean "below", as here.

³⁶ J. Ulrich, *Die Anfänge der abendländischen Rezeption des Nizänums*, PTS 39, Berlin/NewYork 1994, 250.

49-53 at the end of the section (and thus at the end of c. 31). To begin with the literary cross-references in lines 51 and 53: Victorinus says that he had thus 'taught in many books' - this must refer to the *passio recessionis a patre*; and that 'elsewhere' he had expressed himself more fully, - here the immediate reference is to the origin of the *hyle*.

Hadot deals with the problem of cross-references in Victorinus in the introduction to the German translation of the theological writings, pp. 35-43. That some cross-references should refer to lost theological writings is an explanation that Hadot confronts with methodological skepticism: "Since this solution cannot be verified, it should only be considered in extreme cases" (p. 35). Nevertheless, he concedes (p. 37): "Then there is evidence to suggest that Victorinus is referring to theological writings other than those that have come down to us". Among the passages Hadot cites is our passage (p. 38): "With regard to the work of Victorinus known to us, however, the formulation *in multis libris* is quite exaggerated and *haec plenius alibi* rather vague. One must either assume that the other theological works have been lost, or admit that Victorinus' biblio- graphical data do not offer any exact clues". In these and some other cases, one can, in my opinion, very well opt for the first possibility. One would also like to know how the "many books" and the "elsewhere" - "elsewhere" definitely means "not here", but does it also mean "somewhere else than in the many books"? Did Victorinus even write a certain book about the origin of matter? Unfortunately, the question cannot be answered as the text stands.

IV 31,51-53 is even more interesting as far as its *content* is concerned. Hadot notes that the *passio recessionis a patre* is the opposite of what Victorinus says in I 22,51-55 and IV 32,4 f.. This applies to the first passage, I 22,51 f.: *Illā enim passionē non dicuntur: generatio a patre, motus primus et creatorem esse omnium*. In IV 32,4-6 we read on the one hand: *in actu passionē extitisse*; on the other hand: *numquam separatū a patre ex aeterno*, neither before nor now nor in the future. Is *recessio* therefore not to be equated with *separatio*? The *non-separatio* must probably refer to the *substantia*. I 51,32 would confirm this: *veluti defecit a potentia patris*. - Hadot's reference to Jamblichus³⁷ contributes to the fact that the transition from unity to duality can already be understood as suffering: The dyad is referred to by three different synonyms for 'suffering'. With regard to the *tenebrae* (IV 31,52) as a consequence (*consecuta*) of the "separation from the Father", Hadot wonders whether this might not be an allegorical interpretation of the sequence of darkness and the call to abandonment in Mk 15,33 f.³⁸ - an excellent observation; I would consider this to be a typically Gnostic exegesis. As far as the origin of the *hyle* is concerned, Plotinus attributes to the Gnostics the

³⁷ SC 69, 1048 to adv. ar. IV 31,51.

³⁸ Ibid (before the quotation from Jamblichus).

opinion (Enn. II 9,3,17); "que la matière était une conséquence indirecte, mais nécessaire" ³⁹. In note 573 of the German translation on the sequence *recessio - passio - tenebrae = hyle* in our passage, Hadot naturally recalls Gnostic speculations and mentions Irenaeus, haer. I 4,1 f. Tardieu also cites our passage as the eighth point of contact with Gnostic thought in Marius Victorinus (Tardieu/Hadot p. 11a). One must also take Irenaeus, haer. I 2, where "some" tell the story of the origin of matter not from Achamoth (the lower Sophia), but from the actual Sophia (which facilitates the transfer to the Logos), and in a simpler form. The version that Irenaeus refers to in haer. I 4, however, contains the [529] ideas of separation and necessity relevant to the Victorine passage (namely, being thrown into the shadow, into the void; I 4,1). Both versions end with Irenaeus' statement that this is what "they" say about the "first beginning of the substance of matter" (haer. I 2,3 end), or about the "coming into being and substance of matter" (haer. I 4,2 beginning).

Once again, the passage mentioned by Hadot on adv. Ar. IV 31, I 51,31 f. (see above). It is the *prima motio*, in which it (life) *veluti deficit a potentia patris*, "removed itself, as it were, from the power of the Father" (so Hadot in the French translation; in the German translation one reads: It "got rid of" "the power of the Father, as it were" - which does not seem to me to be so close to the original and sounds more like Phil 2). We recognize the relativizing *veluti*. On the other hand, the idea is included in an exposition on "the feminine and masculine state" of Christ, which Tardieu (p. 10b) lists as the second of the themes that Victorinus has in common with the Gnostics: "Androgyny du Logos".

We now turn to the antipatristic chapter adv. Ar. I 44 (and the beginning of 45), which I put aside above. Are we then Patristic if we have taught the foregoing? Victorinus asks. To show the difference between the truth and the *serpentinum dogma* of those, he summarizes their doctrine: They say that the only God (*solum deum*) is he whom we call Father, that he alone is the Existent One and the Creator; that he not only came into the world, but also into the flesh *et alia omnia quae nos filium fecisse dicimus*. On the other hand, we say (among other things) not only "one", but "one and one", *aliud autem impassibile unum, aliud passum*. Victorinus' further explanations push the suffering of the Logos/Son further and further into the history of salvation. The author is more reserved here than in the parallel passage I 22,44-55 (including commentary), to which Hadot refers in his commentary on I 44,1-50. 44,16-25: Insofar as the Logos is *cause*, he does not remain in himself, although he is always Logos and therefore unchangeable. He becomes "different" (*alius et alius*) according to the

³⁹ Ibid. to adv. ar. IV 31,52.

genera eorum quae sunt, while he remains in the Father as *universalis logos*. *Passiones* are therefore to be placed neither in the Father nor in the Son, but in those who, depending on their *genus*, do not receive the full power of the *logos universalis*, but rather the power assigned to them. Only with regard to the Incarnate One can we speak of *passio*, lines 27-32: *Secundum carnem ergo salvator passus est, secundum spiritum autem quod erat* (sc. before the Incarnation) *sine passione*. Being Son is not a *passio*, nor that he does or speaks anything; everything happens by divine power without *passio*. Thus the Son's movement, both substantial and divine, is rather a movement, but not a *passio* - After all that we have read before, a great exclamation mark is to be made here. - Victorinus, however, knows very well that the problem posed by the Patripassians did not yet lie here, see lines 32-38: It was not because of this that there were Patripassians, but [530] because of the cross; these wicked men said that the *Father* had been crucified, whereby they "involve" the incapable of suffering in suffering. They do not realize that there must necessarily be something incapable of suffering if there is something that suffers. "We say, however, that the Son is also incapable of suffering insofar as he is Logos, but insofar as he has 'become flesh' he is capable of suffering." The emotions that Victorinus lists in lines 38-40: Pity, anger, joy, sorrow and the like are "there (*ibi*)" (in the incarnate) not *passiones*, but nature and substance. Hadot gives no commentary on these lines in SC 69; in note 236 to the German translation he summarizes them with the following text and refers them to God; Hadot would thus have the Old Testament in mind. But could it not also be meant Christologically? The problem of Christ's emotional movements was disputed between the Arians and Athanasius at the beginning of the forties of the 4th century. The Arians saw in the emotions of Jesus' soul attested by the New Testament proof of the lesser degree of his divinity, which made his οὐσία different from the Father. In the sequel, Victorinus speaks of the work of the *Spirit* (lines 40-45), which seems to me to confirm the Christological interpretation. The work of the Spirit is more precisely the work of his "fragrance": *beneolentia* = εὐωδία from 2 Cor 2:15. But verses 15 and 16 (from which the next key words in line 41 of Victorinus come) do not refer to the Spirit in Paul, but to our relationship with Christ. Although the Spirit is "per se the best", as Victorinus says, he is "for some to life, for some to death". This does not mean, however, that it is changed in its nature, but by the matter and the will of those who experience it (*patientium*) ("its effect changes", one must add). In the next sentence, the idea is generalized again: The immutable deity "is said" to be "afflicted" and to "suffer" depending on whether it (i.e. its actions) is received, "as it should be, or otherwise". And indeed "it is said" because we judge the divine from our senses. But the divine nature as such is incapable of suffering (line 49 f.). In the summarizing rejection of the Patripassians in c. 45, it then says again in lines 1-3: *nos et patrem dicimus et filium* (this is the rejection of the identification of both), *ipsum solum passibilem iuxta motum in*

hyle. Hadot says, *in hyle* means *in carne*, because of the suffering statements of c. 44. But it is no accident that Victorinus uses this more general formulation of his discourse on the suffering Logos; it does not imply only the *extremum progressionis* (= incarnation), as Hadot's reference to I 22,50 would have it, for there it is preceded in line 49 by: *in progressu passio*. "The suffering of the Savior according to the flesh", I 44,27, is of course a common Christian statement. But what is special about Victorinus is the suffering of the Creator-Logos in relation to creation and his actions in the *hyle*. The fact that this idea has been taken up in the summarizing confession of I 47 shows *its systemic character*. Unfortunately, Hadot does not pass any judgment on this peculiar theologoumenon of Victorinus, however excellently he interprets it in the respective context.

Let us now return to the style of Tardieu/Hadot's study. As a second chapter, Tardieu presents "Eléments de chronologie" (pp. 19-26), i.e. dates from 246 to 397/398, from Amelius' entry into Plotinus' school to the death of Ambrose. I quote from the introduction to this chapter (p. 19a): "Les réalisations de la philosophie païenne dans l'après-Numenius (Plotinus, Porphyrius) vont contribuer à la christianization des élites (Victorinus, Ambroise, Augustin). Les derniers gnostiques n'y effarouchent plus personne, sauf les philosophes dont ils ont adopté le langage. Comme on la voit avec la dispute d' Aèce avec un Borborien (? 353), les gnostiques vont devenir contre les ariens les alliés objectifs de l'orthodoxie". On the year 263 (the arrival of Porphyrius in Plotinus' school in Rome), Tardieu notes the Gnostic writings that were known in the school and their refutations (p. 20). Unlike myself (1983), Ruth Majercik (1992) and Andrew Smith (1987) (Tardieu pp. 13b- 15a), Tardieu does not assume that the treatises preserved in Nag Hammadi were edited under the influence of Porphyry's philosophy.

Chapter III (pp. 27-45): "Synopse d'un exposé de métaphysique commun à Marius Victorinus et au *Zostrien* (Nag Hammadi Codices VIII,1)". The synopsis has two forms (p. 27): "La partie de cet exposé, concernant la méthode dite de théologie négative, est rigoureusement et textuellement la même chez Marius Victorinus I 49, 7-10. 18-40 et dans le *Zostrien* copte 64,11-66,12". "À partir de Marius Victorinus I 50,1 = *Zostrien* 66,12, c'est-à-dire à partir du début de la partie de l'exposé consacré à la méthode dite de la théologie positive", the text is no longer literally identical. The synopsis here looks like this: "Les éléments de la théologie positive de l'exposé", which correspond to Marius Victorinus I 50,1-18 and, distributed over Zostrianus 66-75, are paraphrased,

"seront regroupés sous la forme de six testimonia". Tardieu precedes the synopsis with the two Victorinus chapters, first in a photograph of the beautiful Berlin manuscript, then in a line-by-line reproduction from the CSEL edition. In the actual synopsis (Tardieu pp. 34-45), the Coptic text is accompanied by an interlinear French translation. For adv. ar. I 50 and the Coptic side of the material, it was Tardieu's intention "de fixer les limites de la source commune jusqu'aux fragments littéraires 1 et 2", "et non de rassembler tous les passages de *Zostrien* présentant des parallèles doctrinaux avec cette source ou une phraséologie analogue.

Comme Victorinus de son côté, l'auteur gnostique s'inspire largement de ce morceau métaphysique" (p. 38b)⁴⁰.

[532] Chapter IV (pp. 47-58): "Édition critique de la version copte de l'exposé", a restoration of the very destroyed Coptic text on the basis of the synopsis of Chapter III, with French translation. I have compiled linguistic comments by Coptological colleagues above.

Chapter V (pp. 59-114; therein pp. 113b-114 additional remarks by P. Hadot): "Divergences et variantes. Pour un commentaire de l'exposé". This is the main part of the book and of stupendous literacy in philosophical and Gnostic texts. The brilliant didactician that Tardieu is, he prefaces the commentary with its outline, which is at the same time a systematic analysis of the text under examination and thus an overview of its highly abstract expositions (p. 59 f.). The difficulty for the reviewer lies in selecting from the rich material.

The exposé begins with the words *Sic audi ut dico*, declaring what follows to be a revelation. "Cet artifice littéraire est essentiel et a pour but d'assimiler l'exposé métaphysique à un *logos* sacré, reçu au terme d'une montée ou descente" (p. 61a).

Adv. Ar. I 49,10-18 "Dénomination de l'Un et premiers éléments descriptifs" (commented on by Tardieu pp. 62b-65b) has not been adopted by "Zostrianus". Tardieu's commentary shows that he does not consider Hadot's attribution of the anonymous Parmenides commentary to Porphyrius to be certain; Tardieu places "Porphyrius" as the author's name in angle brackets. - "None of the elements that describe the One in I 49,10-18 is specifically Neoplatonic. They are indeed to be found, as in the Gnostics (the *clarus magister* [of Irenaeus, haer. I 11,3], in the Apocryphon Johannis, Allogenes, in other passages of Zostrianus), in Middle Platonism (Apuleius, Alcinoüs, Numenius, Clement of Alexandria)". The fact that this piece is missing in the Coptic parallel is probably due to an abridgement by the author of the "Zostrianus". In contrast to the *clarus magister* and Zostrianus, Victorinus preserved all the steps of the argumentation in his complete text (p. 65b).

Adv. Ar. I 49,18-26, Zostrianus 64,17-65,4 (Tardieu pp. 65b-75a): "La négation de toutes les formes". "Cette méthode descriptive, très élaborée, présente dans l'exposé" "la particularité de regrouper comme prédicats de l'Un des attributs négatifs platoniciens ou platonisés, originellement ne s'appliquant pas tous à l'Un". They are organized as follows: "Les premiers énumérés, qui concernent les exclusions d'égalité, de la détermination et de division, sont traditionnellement attestés comme prédicats de l'Un; ils sont à rattacher au *Parménide* et au *Sophiste*. Then the

⁴⁰ At the time, Hadot had printed the piece under the "Textes porphyriens de l'œuvre théologique de Marius Victorinus, Groupe II", spread over four paragraphs: Porphyre et Victorinus II, Paris 1968, 27-29.

termes qui, dans le *Phèdre*, qualifient le monde intelligible. Les troisièmes énumérés sont de qualificatifs traditionnels de la matière depuis le *Timée*."

This tripartite structure points to the three principles of Middle Platonic metaphysics: God, model/forms/ideas, matter (p. 65b). The exposé and Plotinus' thinking are comparable with regard to the treatment of the One (from the [533] Parmenides): The One is no longer the object of logical exercises, but of theological meditation. The transition from one to the other had already taken place in Middle Platonism.

On individual predicates: *immensum* = ἀμέτρητον is rare in Middle Platonic texts, but abundantly attested in the Gnostics (p. 66b). The next predicate, *invisible* = ἀόρατον, is curiously absent from the Coptic parallel, although it is constantly used by the Gnostics as an expression for transcendence (p. 67b). The Gnostic habit of applying "invisible" to God cannot be derived from Plato or the Platonic tradition, but comes from the religious philosophy of the first two centuries, the New Testament included, as did Philo. "Dans tous ces écrits, juifs, chrétiens ou païens, Dieu est dit 'invisible' pour signifier qu'il échappe à la connaissance". (A. Orbe has shown that in all these texts, including the Gnostic ones, "to see" means "to understand", so that ἀόρατος is synonymous with ἄγνωστος). The invisible "name", namely Father or Spirit, has a visible name or image only in "Son" or "Intellect" (p. 67b).

Sine colore = ἀχρώματον (p. 71 f.). "Colorless", Greek or Coptic, is absent from the Gnostic literature, apart from "Zostrianus", i.e. the Coptic witness of the exposé. "On a là, par conséquent, un autre indice que la section du *Zostrien* commune avec Victorinus, dans laquelle figurent les deux attributs négatifs du *Phèdre* appliqués à l'Un, n'est pas d'origine gnostique." (p. 72b).

Tardieu would like to consider two small excesses in Victorinus *sine qualitate* and *sine forma* to be Middle Platonic glosses by Victorinus (these are two of several cases where one cannot quite decide whether Zostrianus abridges or Victorinus adds) (p. 73b). "La double exclusion de la forme et de la figure ... est, en tant qu'argument de théologie négative, bien représentée chez les Gnostiques mais n'est pas une création gnostique", rather they are Middle Platonic terms (p. 74b). Tardieu concludes this section of the commentary with the conclusion (p. 75a) that the exposé is not gnostic.

Adv. Ar. I 49,26-40, Zostrianus 65,4-66,12 (Tardieu pp. 75a-88b): "La voie d'émittance". At the beginning of the piece commented on here, we find the following three expressions for "primauté par antériorité" (p. 76a): *prima causa*, *praeprincipium*, *praeintelle- gentia*. *Prima causa* is nowhere else to be found in Gnostic literature (p. 77b), again an indication that the Exposé is a pagan philosophical text (p. 78a). Victorinus himself has a penchant for neologisms with the prefix of anteriority, constructed on the model of πρόον: *praecausa*, *praecognoscentia*, *prae- divinatio*, *praexistentia* (Tardieu lists even more). Most of these can already be found in the Gnostics (think also of the title *Protennoia trimorphos*,

NHC XIII,1). The first witness to Gnostic word formations of this kind is Irenaeus; Plotinus avoids them, but not the later Neoplatonists (pp. 78 f.).

[534] The larger part of the commented section, I 49,29-40 in Victorinus, is a litany of statements "sur le dépassement des oppositions et différences", its series is structured by "a threefold invocation of the power inherent in that which, transcending all oppositions and differences, is the One Whole" (p. 79b). The text also contains an insertion by Victorinus (p. 80b), which stands out as a kind of commentary within the "Litany" due to its sentence rhythm and content. I also cite this here in Tardieu's optical arrangement as an example of style.

Exposé: *ipsa motione celebrior,*
ipso statu stabilior

Vict: *motione enim ineloquibili status est,*
statu autem ineffabili superrelativa motio est

In contrast to the style of the immediate context, an additional exaggeration is created with the elimination of opposites in the crossing of concepts.

I place next to it adv. ar. I 49, 23-26 in Tardieu's optical arrangement (p. 70b below - p. 71a above); here, too, the insertions have no parallels in the "Zostria- nus".

Exposé: *sine figura*
sine qualitate

Vict...: *neque inequalitate*
sine qualitate quale

Exposé: *sine colore*
sine specie
sine forma

Vict: *omnibus formis carens,*
neque quod sit ipsa forma
qua formantur omnia

Victorinus' penchant for wordplay is unmistakable, and not only here.

Compared to various lists from the religious philosophical literature compiled by Tardieu (pp. 81-82a), that of the Exposé appears both more original and more complex. The "dialectical organization" of the terms, as it is presented here, is not found elsewhere in Gnostic literature; it belongs to middle Platonism (p. 82a). Incidentally, without the Latin version of the exposé, the search for the Greek termini behind the Coptic ones would be a rather hopeless task. "De façon inattendue, c'est un rhéteur de Rome qui aujourd'hui fait progresser la coptologie. Thanks, in fact, to Marius Victorinus, one can recognize that the Egyptophone translator of the Greek *Zostrien* is not entirely

dépourvu de métier et d'habilité". However, he is not familiar with philosophical terminology. This is also an indication [535] that the exposé does not originate from Gnosis (p. 82b). From the point of view of the history of ideas, the predicates in pairs of opposites, which refer to movement, division and mixture, are used in the philosophies of the 2nd and 3rd centuries in the wake of Aristotle and the Stoics to designate states of matter. Physical terminology is also applied metaphysically to the One in this text, as was the case with the negation of forms in the previous section (p. 83a).

To adv. ar. I 49,36 f. *vere ðv totum, vere quae sunt*
omnia ipsum existens,

Tardieu (p. 85b) remarks that this is the only statement in the series that does not contain an ascent; he translates it, as the Coptic does, as: "le tout véritablement existant et les véritablement existants, il est tous ceux-là". The ascending ladder from the "vere quae sunt" to their cause, the "vere totum", can be read in Ad Cand. 7,2-7. It is interesting that this passage is introduced like the exposé, i.e. as a revelation: *audi quemadmodum dico* - how do the pieces belong together? - The line from adv. ar. I 49 is, as Hadot has already stated *ad locum*, "not compatible with the transcendence of the One". But it is a very old formula; this forbids adapting its wording to the context (p. 86a).

The statements about the *via eminentiae* have been placed by the author of the exposé between three doxologies (see the outline on p. 80a), which characterize the One as "power": "la triple invocation de la puissance". These formulas are not to be taken angelologically, but metaphysically. "Ces formules indiquent que l'argumentation de *via eminentiae* n'est pas un raisonnement dialectique systématisé, mais une langage de méditation religieuse entrant dans le cadre d'une révélation" (p. 86b). *Potentia potentiarum* of the middle doxology (missing in "Zostrianus") is an expression of great rarity; Tardieu knows of only two other examples (p. 87b).

Adv. Ar. I 50,1-21, Zostrianus 66,12-84,22 (Tardieu pp. 88b-110): "Le tout intérieur à l'Un". From here on, as already mentioned, the exposé was treated differently by the two traditionaries: While Victorinus offers a coherent text, its components have been interwoven by "Zostrianus" in key words, paraphrases, shorter quotations into his own exposition. As a result, the Coptic text can no longer be fully reconstructed with the help of the Latin. "Outre leur lacunes, les dix-huit pages du *Zostrien* à examiner (66,12- 84,22) sont passablement embrouillées du point de vue de leur contenu. Elles utilisent une abondante terminologie philosophique, celle-là même employée par Marius Victorinus, mais sont entremêlées de traits et de réflexions proprement gnostiques qui aboutiront aux doxologies de Barbélo dans les pages 86-87 et suivantes." Marius Victorinus, on the other hand [536], offers a secure, short, homogeneous and coherent text (Tardieu pp. 88-89a).

Tardieu first comments on Victorinus (pp. 89a-105b) and then on the fragments in Zostrianus (pp. 105b-110a). Adv. Ar. I 50 is written in the same pathetic style of a philosophical-religious meditation as c. 49. It contains a series of statements of positive theology "portant sur la forme, à la fois unifiante et extensive, de la puissance (ou Tout) inhérente à l'Un et sur les conséquences de la préexistence dans le Premier de ce qui est appelé à sortir de lui pour devenir second" (p. 89a). The philosophical-historical problem of the text is the designation of the first principle as πνεῦμα; it was already sharply perceived by Hadot when one did not yet know anything about the exposé used together. Hadot: "Comment admettre qu'un néoplatonicien ait pu donner à l'Un le nom de *Pneuma*? "⁴¹ Therefore, it is not certain for him "que le développement concernant le dénomination d'*Esprit* provienne d'une source néo-platonicienne "⁴² (Tardieu p. 91a). - I am already asking here whether this problem remains as acute if one has to take the *Middle Platonic* provenance of the text into consideration with Tardieu. In addition, below I will postulate a different grammatical understanding of *spiritus* from I 50.5, with which Hadot's difficulty

m. E. almost disappears.

Tardieu divides c. 50 into four sections. The first: Adv. Ar. I 50,1-7 (Tardieu pp. 91a-98a): "Les dénominations de l'Un dans son rapport au Tout". (In the wake of my new translation of the critical *spiritus* - see below - one would have to extend the passage to line 8 ... *a semet ipso*). In the course of his detailed commentary, Tardieu notes that "Allogenes" (NHC XI,3), like "Zostrianus", draws a large part of its terminology from the exposé (p. 92b); the "Three Stelae of Seth" (NHC VII,5) are also familiar with the exposé (p. 97a).

Tardieu (pp. 93a-98a) devotes special attention to the expression *tri- potens* ... *spiritus* from 50.4 f., Greek would correspond to τὸ τριδύναμον πνεῦμα (i.e., Tardieu assumes that *tripotens* and *spiritus* are in the same casus); Victorinus adv. Ar. IV 21,26 has τριδύναμος *est deus*. The adjective is common among Gnostics. Tardieu is of the opinion that in all sources *tripotens spiritus* is used in a double sense, metaphysically and arithmologically; this results in the ambivalence of the position it occupies in the divine hierarchy. Thus Tardieu deals first with the metaphysical interpretation (pp. 93a-95b), then with the arithmological interpretation (pp. 95b-98a). P. 96a: The two exegeses must be distinguished according to content and origin. The numerical interpretation belongs to the Pythagorean and Neo-Pythagorean tradition, the metaphysical explanation is Middle Platonic. However, Tardieu's distinction comes up against Hadot's contradiction in his Re[537]marques additionelles (a, p. 113b; an asterisk in the margin refers to this in Tardieu): He, Hadot, does not see where the interest of a distinction between the two interpretations of the threefold *potentia* should lie. "Les formules 'arithmologi-

⁴¹ Porphyre et Victorinus I, 225 f.

⁴² Ibid. 297.

ques' se réfèrent toujours tacitement aux formules 'métaphysiques'". Tardieu himself begins (p. 93a) with the equation of πνεῦμα and θεός in the middle Stoa and with the well-known statements about the all-pervading and all-encompassing and therefore unifying πνεῦμα. "Notion avantageuse par la philosophie de sa fonction hégémonique et unifiante résultant de la conception tonique de son mouvement, le pneuma stoïcien reste une catégorie explicative de la matière. Dès lors qu'en perspective platonicienne elle devient par transfert ou transposition une catégorie et un nom de transcendance, un réajustement est nécessaire, ne serait-ce que par un trait de polémique antistoïcienne" (pp. 93bf.). Thus the exposé of the *deus/pater* not only says *tripotens in unalitate spiritus*, but also in the next colon: *perfectus et supra spiritum* (line 5). This is explained again (lines 5-7): *non enim spirat, sed tantum spiritus est in eo quod est ei esse, spiritus spirans in semetipsum ut sit spiritus*. Tardieu says that the author of the exposé has (with the colon from line 5) established the equation that the One (God, Father) = *spiritus*. He thus follows the translation and Hadot's commentary (compare Hadot's lemma in the commentary on I 50,1-21: "L'Un est Dieu et Esprit").

But is this true? The beginning of c. 50 initially establishes an equation between the *unum* of c. 49 and the *deus/pater* and does so in the style of Revelation: *hic est deus, hic est pater*. There is no explicit identification of *deus/pater* and *spiritus* in the same way. Hadot and, following him, Tardieu take it for granted and tacitly assume that in the colon *tripotens in unalitate spiritus* the last word, *spiritus*, is in the nominative case; the following *perfectus* is understood as an adjective to *spiritus* (cf. Hadot's translation: "Esprit parfait...", where "Esprit" by Hadot; analogous in the German translation).

In my opinion, *spiritus* in the colon *tripotens* ... should be taken as a genitive: "three-powerful in *unalitas* of the spirit". Here we have the "fonction unifiante" of the spirit, transferred to transcendence, to the Godhead itself. The same function also 50,18: *indiscernibilis spiritus cunitio*, in this case Hadot and Tardieu have translated *spiritus* as a genitive. The next colon of line 5, *perfectus et supra spiritum*, refers back to the one previously described as superperfectus⁴⁵, so it is not the spirit that is "perfect beyond the spirit", but the *deus/pater*⁴⁶. Man [538] compare the resumption of "three-powerful" in adv. ar. IV 21,26: τριδύναμος

⁴³ Not translated in SC 68, but in the German volume.

⁴⁴ Translated as "et" in SC 68, not at all in the German volume. The correct word would be "aussi".

⁴⁵ For this reading (instead of *super perfectos*) see Tardieu p. 27b and p. 92b.

⁴⁶ Adv. Ar. I 50,4-6 *perfectus superperfectus* (the reading preferred by Tardieu), *tripotens in unalitate spiritus, perfectus et supra spiritum: non enim spirat*, is translated by Hadot thus [538] (emphasis his own): "parfait au-dessus des parfaits (following the other reading), *Esprit*, ayant en son unité, une triple puissance, Esprit parfait et qui est audessus de l'Esprit: car il ne souffle pas", whereas in my opinion it should read (my emphases): "parfait, superparfait (according to one reading), trois-puissant en unité de l'esprit, parfait aussi au-dessus de l'esprit, car il ne souffle pas."

est deus - Victorinus obviously referred the *tripotens* of the exposé to God and does the same here. The equation of *unum* with *spiritus* therefore does not take place. In the sequence *perfectus, superperfectus, tripotens* ... "three-powerful" must have been thought of as a further intensification. It is interesting that the word *spiritus* is followed by a series of explanations which are intended to clarify the relationship of the spirit to *deus/pater*. As already mentioned above, these explanations go not only as far as *ut sit spiritus* in 50.7, but also include the next two colons of lines 7 and 8: *quoniam est spiritus/inseparabilis a semetipso*. Tardieu's printed arrangement p. 89b should be changed accordingly. The subject of the two colons just quoted is *not deus/pater*, but the "spirit" of the preceding colon (*ut sit spiritus*). The whole small section (lines 5-8 *perfectus et supra - inseparabilis a semetipso*) is also conspicuous for its argumentative style: *non enim, sed tantum, ut sit, quoniam*, and stands out from the hymnic tone. Who wrote the explanations?

The colon *perfectus et supra spiritum rejects* the possible conclusion that the spirit could be the superior magnitude because of its unifying function. The superiority of the grammatical subject *deus/pater* over the *spiritus* arises from the fact that God *does not* "breathe" (*spirat*)⁴⁷. Only the spirit does this. *Spiritus* cannot be separated from *spirare*, so that the character of the spirit is preserved (*ut sit spiritus!*); he breathes *in semet ipsum*, "because the spirit is inseparably *a semet ipso*"⁴⁸. I have difficulties with the two reflexive pronouns; if they are taken strictly syntactically, they must be related to the spirit; Hadot and Tardieu do the same. But the issue here is still the relationship of the spirit to the One, to the *deus/pater* - would it not make more sense to see the *deus/pater in the semet ipse*, "into which the spirit breathes" and "from which it is inseparable"? [539] Victorinus would thus take up the *semet ipsum* of 50.3, where it is said of *God*: "preserving himself (*semet ipsum*) in motionless movement".

The *ipsi sibi et locus et habitator, in semet ipso manens* (50,8 f.) means God again and would easily follow *perfectus, superperfectus, tripotens in unalitate spiritus* of 50,4 f. without the explanatory cola about the spirit.

All this could be better judged if a literal Coptic version of this part of the exposé were available. I find it very remarkable that the

⁴⁷ The next sentence, qualifying, line 6 (my emphasis): *sed tantum spiritus est in eo, quod est ei esse*, looks like a clumsy and too literal translation from the Greek. (Cf. also lines 12 f. below: *in potentia eius quod est esse, hoc est existentiae*, etc.). For Hadot, the subject of the sentence, as a consequence of his translation of *spiritus* in line 5, is *deus/pater = spiritus*: "mais il est Esprit en ce qui est son être," - but then why *tantum*? I suggest: "Mais l'esprit est seulement en ce qui est l'être pour lui". Even so, syntactic connection and interpretation remain difficult, unless one considers *spiritus spirans* of the following colon together with the *est* of our line as the complete predicate: "mais l'esprit est seulement en ce qui est l'être pour lui *esprit soufflant* etc." (my emphasis). (my emphasis).

⁴⁸ Hadot's commentary on the passage, SC 69, 851, finds here the inward *and* outward breathing of the Spirit. But we are not talking about the latter here.

The text particles from the exposé scattered across pages 66 and 67 of "Zostrianus" do not contain a translation of the so conspicuous *tripotens in unalitate spiritūs* (it would of course be a translation from the Greek). It is true that Tardieu (p. 41) places "C'est l'Esprit unique" alongside Zostrianus 67,19 f. as a possible comparative cola I 50,10 (*simpli- citate unus qui sit*) and I 50,4 f. (*in unalitate spiritus*) from Victorinus. But before that, the "one" of Zostrianus 66,14 had already been mentioned: Father (67,5), Mother (67,6), Idea of the Idea (67,13), "Et il existe en tant que logos" (67,15 f.), Tardieu pp. 39 and 40. One can debate whether the lines that follow the spirit statement in "Zostrianus" (place of itself, dwells in itself, 67,21 f.), with the literal parallels in Victorinus and in the same sequence, refer to the spirit or to the One (thus repeating the problem discussed above). But since the existence as Logos is immediately spoken of again, Zostrianus 67,24-68,1 "It is He who...", I regard the statement about the Spirit as one link among others, and not even the first, of a series of determinations about the One. Incidentally, for Barbelostics the Spirit as the first principle is quite unproblematic.

In connection with the problem of the correct interpretation of the *in unalitate spi- rite* of adv. ar. I 50,4, IV 24, 21-39 should also be consulted. This passage is a single sentence, except for the last two words, which read: *Haec deus* (cf. the beginning of I 50: *Hic est deus, hic pater*). The beginning of the section refers to what immediately precedes it, a treatise on *cognoscentia* and *cognosci- bile* in God. IV 24,21: If it may be permitted, the author wants to speak in the same way of the "First". Three synonymous designations are placed alongside the first, all of which are obviously to be placed in quotation marks like the first; this results from the fact that, as before the first three *nomina*, which are neuter, so also before the fourth, the masculine *deus*, is the neutral *illud*: *illud "primum", illud "unum", illud "solum", illud "deus"* (p. 21 f.). This is followed by an endless list of predications, the first sixteen (!) of which are strung together with *vel*⁴⁹. I 50 is recalled by the first two predicates with *vel*: *vel spiritus, vel spirans*, then it continues with *vel lumen, vel* [540] *luminans*; a pattern for the next lines in the enumeration is the following *vel existens, vel omniexistens* ... What matters here, if we recall the problem of the relation of *unum* and *spiritus*, is the fact that the spirit does not belong to the *illud series*, but to the *vel series*. It is therefore not permissible to cut out *illud deus vel spiritus* from Victorinus' text and thereby ascribe to the spirit the same rank in the hierarchy of being as to the One. For this reason, it is not correct for Hadot to group the key words of the first lines in the commentary on IV 24,21-39 as follows: *unum, solum; deus, spiritus, lumen*⁵⁰ - the semicolon must come after *deus*. (The rest of the structure naturally corresponds to the text; it is also useful to recall the Apocryphon of John with its content-

⁴⁹ Hadot translates each *illud* with "ce", leaving the many *vel* untranslated.

⁵⁰ SC 69, 1035; my emphasis.

comparable list: light, life, bliss, knowledge - both as being and as gift).

Here we return to Tardieu's commentary on the exposé. Of course, the interpretation based on the nominative translation of *spiritus* in I 50,5 pervades everything that follows⁵¹ and would have to be corrected in my view.

Adv. Ar. I 50,8-10 "L'intégralité de l'Un comme cause de Tout" (pp. 98a-99b). According to what I have said above, the passage in line 8 only begins with the words *ipse sibi et locus* ... The formulations in line 8 are all traditional (p. 98b). *Manens in se* also IV 24,32 (said by the One⁵²) (p. 99a).

Adv. Ar. I 50,10-18 "La participation plénière du Tout à l'Un" (pp. 99b-102a). "These lines of the exposé exhibit a characteristic literary trait", the asyndetic sequence gives way to an "argumentation with the help of complete and connected sentences" (p. 99b). After the Latin text of the section, Tardieu prints his own translation (p. 100a), for which he uses Hadot's analyses from

"Porphyrius et Victorinus", as he says (p. 99b). Tardieu's translation appears more literal than Hadot's in SC 68. Moreover, Hadot had examined the text so thoroughly (Porphyrius et Victorinus I, Cap. IV-VI) that only a few things could be added (p. 100b). On 50.10, *simplicitate unus qui sit / tres potentias cōuniens*, Tardieu takes up a literal relationship between the Turin Parmenides commentary and our exposé, which Hadot had already noticed when the exposé was still regarded as a text by Victorinus himself. In the Turin Commentary this is linked to a reference to a statement that comes from the Chaldean Oracles⁵³. On this (and [541] generally on the section pp. 100b-101a in Tardieu) there is a longer note by Hadot (in our volume pp. 113b-114a). The Turin commentator speaks of people who hold a certain opinion: οἱ εἰπόντες. Hadot: οἱ εἰπόντες denotes philosophers who quote and perhaps interpret the oracles; Hadot tends to see Numenius behind this. He also notes:

"La formule ἀπλότητι συνηνῶσθαι n'est pas liée nécessairement à la notion d'Esprit (dans les *Oracles* il s'agit du feu)." Tardieu sees the spirit as the grammatical subject of the section of the exposé under discussion here; but if, on the basis of my translation, we take "God" as the subject instead, then the difficulty continues which Tardieu also sees "en raison même de la dénomination d'Esprit (Pneuma) donnée à l'un-Père par l'exposé" (p. 101a above); and indeed the difficulty for the special case of Tardieu's thesis would fall away, according to which from the equation *simplicitate* ... *cōuniens* (Vic-

⁵¹ Z. E.g. as part of the argumentation, Tardieu p. 98a: "Dès lors que le *tripotens pneuma* est in *unalitate*..."

⁵² Tardieu: from the Dieu-Esprit.

⁵³ ἀρπάσαι ἑαυτὸν - For the benefit that can be derived from the oracle verse for the interpretation of the ἀρπαγμός of Phil 2,6, cf. the first essay in my "Drei christologischen Untersuchungen", BZNW 45, Berlin/New York 1981, 1-17. There also the Neoplatonic interpretations of the oracle text.

torinus) = ἀπλότητι συνηνῶσθαι (Turin Commentary), it can be deduced that the Turin Commentary knew the Exposé and that this was therefore a "texte fondateur" of that commentary alongside the Chaldean Oracles. But is this one literal parallel enough? The thesis would be interesting enough in any case.

Adv. Ar. I 50,16: *et idea et λόγος sui ipsius* (subject is *potentia*) - one remembers that this expression set in motion the identification of the exposé. ἰδέα ἑαυτοῦ is found in Numenius, where the expression characterizes "the demiurgic function" of the Second God, "self-producing both the idea of himself and the cosmos", αὐτοποιεῖ τήν τε ἰδέαν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὸν κόσμον" (p. 101b). But in the exposé we are dealing with the *first* principle, which *is* the idea and *logos* (not cosmos) of itself (and not "self-produced"). - In this context, by the way, Tardieu, unlike earlier (see above), no longer mentions the Prologue of John. Hadot already discussed in his Porphyriusbuch⁵⁴ the question of whether this passage could be the Johannine Logos, but considered it unlikely. He adds a useful observation about Victorinus' use of language: "En effet, lorsque Victorinus parle du *Logos* en chrétien, il fait presque toujours allusion au texte même du prologue johannique. Ou alors, il emploie la formule λόγος *vel* νοῦς dans laquelle il souligne explicitement qu'il identifie *Logos* chrétien et intelligence néoplatonicienne". In our place, λόγος and *idea* are synonymous (Tardieu p. 102a).

Adv. Ar. I 50,16 f.: *et vivere et agere habens* - on this Tardieu (p. 102b) summarizes a long passage in Hadot⁵⁵ as follows: "L'agir en soi ou énergie pure de vivre est la caractéristique de l'être de l'Un, ce qu'il y a de plus parfait dans l'ordre de la transscendance et d'absolument incoordonné aux déterminations par les formes et les sub[542]stances". I quote this because Tardieu adds: "*Cette doctrine n'est pas connue avant l'auteur de l'exposé*". Victorinus s'en fera largement l'écho. ⁵⁶

With adv. ar. I 50, 18-21, we have reached the last of the four steps into which Tardieu has divided the second, affirmative half of the exposé (pp. 103a. 104b). It is a kind of "eulogie de l'Un-Tout en style litannique", a series of abstracts that would have the ending -ότης in Greek. This "is the only piece of positive theology in the exposé that the author of Zostrianus literally wrote off". What is written between the two colons on *counitio* at the beginning and end of the passage has been included in the second prayer of the "Three Stelae of Seth". This chain of metaphysical statements was thus understood as a hymnic appeal (p. 103a). The order of the list is not random (see the two diagrams on p. 103), nor is the arrangement in the negative part of the exposé. Finally, Tardieu gives a Greek retroversion of the section (p. 104b), in that

⁵⁴ Porphyre et Victorinus I, 249 f.

⁵⁵ Ibid. 373-390.

⁵⁶ My emphasis.

he draws on the readings of the Coptic parallel for the last three lines. He will therefore discuss and justify them again below; Hadot will criticize the last Greek colon as an unsuccessful retroversion.

A "great commentary" by Victorinus on the Exposé is adv. Ar. IV 21,19-29,38; the Victorinus' "tics du style rhétorique" can be observed particularly well in it (p. 105a).

The examination of the utilization of the second part of the exposé in "Zostrianus" follows pp. 105b-110a. The exegesis of the Gnostic author leads "to an incoherent text which would be very obscure for us" without the Latin witness. It is quite clear that Victorinus cannot depend on "Zostrianus" as far as the exposé is concerned, but must have come to know it in another way, p. 105b. What one finds in "Zostrianus" is a commentary on material from the Apocryphon of John, using the second half of the exposé (p. 105b). No trace has adv. ar. I 50,5-7 in the Coptic, the explanation of *spiritus* whose meaning and function I tried to clarify above. Tardieu thinks that this passage was passed over as uninteresting for the Gnostics because of its rather philosophical-historical character (p. 106a). This seems to me an inadequate explanation. Rather, either the corrective treatment of *spiritus* has caused offense, or this small passage was not found by the author of "Zostrianus" in the text of the exposé he used. The latter is probably more likely; I had already suspected above that the passage is an insertion by Victorinus.

The lack of a literal equivalent of the colon *tripotens in unalitate spiri- tus* in Coptic, which surprised me so much (see above), is not at all surprising to [543] Tardieu; see his discussion of "Zostrianus" 66,7-21 (Testimonium 1, pp. 106b): "Le paraphraste court-circuite ..., car inutile pour lui, l'énoncé arithmologi- que de I 50,4-5: *tripotens in unalitate*". But for the problem of the correct casus of *spiritus*, a literal parallel would have been very helpful; πνεῦμα or πνεύματος of the Greek original could not have been confused by the reader, unlike *spiritus/spiritūs*.

What struck me in the overview of the six testimonies and two fragments from "Zostrianus" to adv. ar. I 50 is the great success of the phrase "idea and logos of himself" (Victorinus I 50,16): Test. 1 "logos des soi-même et idée", Test. 3 "idée d'idée" "en tant que logos", Test. 4 "comme logos et lieu de soi-même", Test. 5 "l'idée et le logos de soi-même".

The reference to Numenius fragment 11 on the second colon of Testimonium 2 (p. 107a and already p. 39a) falls away with the criticism of the Coptological colleagues on the reconstruction of the Coptic text (see above). But if the request "to distinguish" in the Numenius fragment should not be placed alongside the *quare enim dictum est: et ista discernis* from adv. Ar. I 61,26 f.? It looks as if Numenius made use of the same sentence that Victorinus quotes here. Unfortunately, this says nothing about the author. Hadot

has compiled a small list of previously anonymous quotations from Victorinus in our volume (p. 123b below). Among them is also adv. ar. I 52,34 f., ideo *effulgentia dicitur esse*; I see in *effulgentia* a rendering of the ἀπαύγασμα of Heb 1,3 (Sap 7,26).

In Tardieu's concluding remarks (pp. 110a-113b), the question of the author of the exposé is raised, but this can only be answered hypothetically (p. 110a). The exposé must be regarded as a "document fondateur", written by an "auctor respecté". For its two users, the text has the advantage "de présenter une série de rapports métaphysiques dont pouvaient être tirées des applications particulières en fonction d'adversaires visés, ou de doctrines spécifiques". In the case of Marius Victorinus, these are of course Arianism and the doctrine of the Trinity. For "Zostrianus", Tardieu identifies inner-Gnostic connecting lines and fronts (p. 110b). Within this writing, the exposé and the paraphrase of the second half only appear in the final part (in the revelations of Salamex), as an answer to one of the metaphysical questions that Zostrianus is concerned with before his heavenly ascent (p. 111a).

With regard to the problem of how much knowledge Victorinus had of gnosis, which also arises when Valentinus is mentioned, Tardieu (p. 111b) adopts Hadot's view on adv. Ar. I 16,1 f. Hadot: "La doctrine que Victorinus prête à Valentin, ne correspond pas tout à fait à celle que rapportent Irénée et Tertullien" 57; in CSEL ad loc. Hadot cites [544] adv. Prax. 8,2. But the sentence in question in Victorinus is nothing other than an abbreviated version of what is found in Tertullian. One only has to consider the whole train of thought of both authors. Victorinus writes: *Quid igitur et tu, Valentine, dicis: processit primus aeon et volens videre patrem non potuit?* This should be answered with John 1:18 (the Son in the bosom of the Father): *non solum ergo patrem videt, sed etiam in patre semper est*. Tertullian, adv. Prax. 8,1-3, has to defend himself (against the Monarchians) against the accusation that he introduces "some προβολή" with his doctrine of the Son, *id est prolationem rei alterius ex altera, quod facit Valentinus, alium atque alium aeonem de aeone producents*. On the other hand, Tertullian has to say "firstly" that one does not have to renounce the "truth" of a vocabulary, because heresy also uses it (the vocabulary is of course *prolatio*) (§ 1). *Prolatus est sermo Dei an non? ... Si prolatus est, cognosce προβολήν veritatis ...* Valentinus προβολάς suas discernit et separat ab auctore et ita longe ab eo ponit ut Aeon patrem nesciat. *Denique desiderat nosse nec potest*, which is very bad for him (§ 2). *... Apud nos autem solus Filius Patrem novit et sinum Patris ipse exposuit* (cf. John 1:18) (§ 3). Victorinus' remark is thus fed by Tertullian, by whatever means. The accusation that Hadot raises against Victorinus for inaccurately reproducing Valentin's teaching is therefore irrelevant.

57 SC 69, 756.

Victorinus has a contemporary occasion to point to the alleged non-knowledge of God by the Son as heretical (*et tu, Valentine*). It suffices to copy Hilarius' communication on the teaching of the Arian Eudoxius from the material that Hadot quotes on the passage⁵⁸: *Quantum enim filius se extendit cognoscere patrem, tantum pater superextendit se ne cognitus filio sit*. Hadot considers, which seems very plausible to me, whether the compilation of anhomoean and valentinian statements was perhaps contained in the homoeusian documents known to Victorinus. Victorinus would then have his knowledge of this point of Valentinian doctrine at third hand: he could not have known the doctrine of the Valentinians from his own experience, otherwise the unbiased statement about the emergence of matter from the suffering of the Logos (see above) would not have been possible for him. It is also inconceivable that he had read Tertullian's *adv. Praxeas*, an anti-Patristic writing (think of the accusations of Patristicism, against which Victorinus has to defend himself! - Perhaps we can already say here that the mention of Valentin in Victorinus and the Gnostic echoes in Victorinus cannot come from the same source.

Back to the question of the author of the exposé, Tardieu p. 112a. Since the "Zostrianus" cannot be Victorinus' source for the exposé, they must have a common source for this text. Its author was a philosopher of the Platonic tradition. But it could not be a Neoplatonist for the reason given by Hadot at the time, that no Neoplatonist had given the name Pneuma to the One. But if I am right, this part of the reasoning falls away. But how purely Platonic would a *Middle Platonist* have to be? Is it impossible for him to assume the unifying function of the Stoic pneuma? And are all representatives of the Middle Platonic school to be lumped together?

In his conclusion, Tardieu also has to take up the question of the dating of the "Zostrianus" again. First I and then Ruth Majercik assumed, on various grounds, that the text in NHC VIII,1 was a Porphyrianizing adaptation of what was available to the Plotinian school. We dated the adaptation to the time after 268 (the dissolution of Plotinus' school)⁵⁹. Tardieu calls our attempts at that time to come to terms with the pneuma problem in Porphyrius

"peu crédibles". My current opinion can be seen from the above. As can already be seen from Tardieu's chronological table, he places the "Zostrianus" in the form known to us in 263 as already existing at the time when Porphyrius joined Plotinus' school (p. 112a).

Tardieu sees in Plotinus, *Enn. II 9 (33) 1,23-26* an allusion of the master to "Zostrianus" 78,10-16 (in Tardieu's translation in our volume p. 15b below) and

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ See above on Tardieu ch. II, p. 20 with reference back to ch. I, pp. 13b-15a.

79,9-14. I give the last passage in Sieber's translation from NHL; in these lines, unlike others, so many Coptic words are preserved that one can probably trust the English translation: "It is [from] the undivided one [that] it moves toward Existence in activity and [intellectual] perception and intellectual life, which was Blessedness and Divinity". Both passages belong in the paraphrase of adv. ar. I 50, i.e. the second half of the exposé (p. 112b above). In contrast to Tardieu, I am unable to find any specific reference by Plotinus to the passages of the "Zostrianus" (i.e. the exposé). A. H. Armstrong⁶⁰ is in any case the opinion that in the first chapter of Plotinus' anti-gnostic treatise there is no discussion of Gnostic doctrines, but rather a discussion within the Platonic school about problems posed by Numenius. Now one could say that this would not stand in the way of a relationship to the Exposé. But as I said, there is too little literal contact between the two texts. The relationship postulated by Tardieu therefore falls down as evidence for the existence of the "Zostrianus" in its current form as early as 263.

The author of the exposé must be a "great figure from the history of Platonism", says Tardieu (p. 112b) and pleads for Numenius because of his great importance, his manifold influence and [546] the special relationship of Amelius to him (p. 113a). Hadot doubts this in his last note additionelle (p. 114b), mainly because of the *spiritus* in adv. Ar. I 50 (in his own nominative translation). Even if the justification is omitted in this form, the problem of the assumption that Numenius is the author of the exposé does not disappear. A glance at the index of the Numenius edition of des Places⁶¹ suffices to recognize that πνεῦμα does not occur at all in the surviving fragments and the verb πνεῖν only once (fragment 24, line 56). There it means "blowing", as the wind blows, and refers to Socrates' changing opinions! None of this seems to me to refer to Numenius.

*Pierre Hadot, "Porphyre et Victorinus.
Questions et Hypothèses (pp. 117-125).*

Hadot takes as his starting point his judgment of 1968, "que l'unique source philosophique de Victorinus était à rechercher dans des textes, perdus, du néoplatonicien Porphyre". This thesis must now be considered in the light of our exposé. Asked for his reaction, Hadot wants to recall the main theses of Victorinus in his theological writings and then the reasons he saw for the close relationship between these writings and Porphyrius. Finally, he sees from

⁶⁰ Plotinus II (LCL 441), 226 f. Note 1.

⁶¹ Numénios. Fragments, ed. É. des Places, CUFr, Paris 1973.

The new situation raises a number of questions that seem unsolvable to him without thorough investigation.

Hadot's overview of Victorinus' theology (pp. 117a-118b) is recommended reading for anyone interested; it would have to be copied in full, which I do not intend to do here. In the way in which Victorinus treats his material, "three types are to be distinguished": 1. "des raisonnements proprement exégétiques et théologiques qui se retrouvent pour la plupart chez les consubstantialistes latins de son époque"; 2. "de présentations de la structure de la Trinité qui correspondent au schéma général que nous avons décrit"; 3. "des développements philosophiques qui font figure de corps étrangers, parce qu'ils introduisent toute sortes des raffinements et de spéculations, qui ne sont pas très utiles à la démonstration théologique proprement dite, et compliquent inutilement le schéma général, en introduisant parfois des incohérences de vocabulaire". In these philosophical passages, Victorinus has retained numerous Greek words from the technical language of the philosophers, which are not usually found in the vocabulary of the Church Fathers. Hence the conclusion that this Latin writer must have used one or more Greek sources for the systematic presentation of his theology of the Trinity (pp. 118b-119a).

[547] The analysis of Victorinus' theological writings led Hadot to distinguish three groups of thought processes, which represented three literary units, which in turn seemed to presuppose three literary sources, but which were closely related to each other in terms of content. Our exposé can be found in the second of these groups (p. 119a).

Only Porphyrius seemed conceivable as a Neoplatonic source for Victorinus; during the entire 4th century he was apparently the only Neoplatonist known in the West (p. 119b). It had to be Porphyrius as commentator of the Chaldean Oracles. Furthermore, there were connections in terms of content and even of a literary nature with the remains of the Turin Parmenides commentary. More than Hadot does, one must emphasize the interesting phenomenon that the two parallels in the wording concern our exposé of all things, namely its second half. The first of the two cases is found in Victorinus, adv. Ar. I 50,10 and in the Parmenides commentary IX 4. Victorinus: "*Il co-unifie en sa simplicité*⁶², lui qui est un, les trois puissances: l'existence universelle, la vie universelle, la béatitude". The Parmenides commentary IX 4, "résumant la doctrine des Oracles chaldaïques" (or its interpreters, see Hadot above on οἱ εἰπόντες, p. 113bf.) has: "Sa puissance et son Intel- lect sont co-unifiés en sa simplicité." Latin *counire* and Greek συνηνῶσθαι are rare enough, the coincidence is hardly accidental (p. 120a). It should be recalled that Hadot, in his note additionnelle (b) just mentioned, notes that "with- united in simplicity" is an expression from the Chaldean Oracles or a

⁶² Highlighted by Hadot.

of their commentators (p. 114a); he also provides a number of sources for the expression in later Neoplatonists. - What does this mean for the origin of the exposé and for the relationship between the exposé and the Turin Commentary?

The other literal relationship is between adv. ar. I 50,8: *quoniam est spiritus inseparabilis a semetipso* (I had referred to *God* in my interpretation of the whole passage about the spirit *semetipso* above) and three passages in the Parmenides commentary. Parm. comm. V 21 f. ἀχώριστον ἑαυτοῦ, "à propos de la connaissance qui est propre à Dieu". The other two passages Hadot quotes I offer in his translation from the edition: Parm. Comm. IV 7 f.: "Mais s'il est vrai que Dieu possède, comme quelque chose d'inséparable de Lui, l'être seul et audessus de tout..."⁶³. XIII 19 f. expresses the pure reference back to himself: "étant essentiellement (ὄντως) impassible, essentiellement inséparable de soi-même"⁶⁴. While Tardieu (p. 98b) says about *inseparabilis a semetipso*: "Cette formulation et les suivantes sont toutes des expressions [548] traditionnelles", but then gives examples in the first paragraph that do not all apply exactly to the matter and in none of the cases contain literal ἀχώριστον, in order to then cite the passages from the commentary in the second paragraph, Hadot says: "Or une telle expression, dans sa littéralité, est, je crois, unique, dans la littérature philosophique" (Tardieu/Hadot p. 120b).

Hadot also reports on the reception of his view of the Porphyriatic authorship of the anonymous Parmenides commentary: W. Theiler and H.-D. Saffrey accepted his thesis. A. Smith and A. Linguisti rejected it (this is why the Turin commentary is missing in Smith's Porphyrius edition in Teubner⁶⁵); Hadot's arguments seemed too hypothetical to them. But they too recognize the Porphyry influence on the commentary. Linguisti would like to place it in the 4th century, whereas Hadot dated it to the 3rd century (p. 121a). - I would add that the later approach to the commentary would simplify the problem of the relationship between commentary and exposé.

Actually, according to Hadot, he had devoted enough of his life to Victorinus: "Ayant passé plus de vingt ans de ma vie à étudier ces questions, je m'étais bien promis, et même juré, de ne plus m'occuper de Victorinus et de laisser à d'autres le soin de corriger mes erreurs éventuelles et de faire de nouvelles découvertes". The discovery of a common source text in "Zostrianism" and Victorinus, however, prompted him to look at the problems once again. (Do not forget that it was Hadot who had initiated the process of discovery by observing the occurrence of *idea et λόγος sui ipsius* on both sides!)

First of all, the one of his theses that postulated literally translated passages from the Greek in Victorinus' work was confirmed. *One* such passage

⁶³ Porphyre et Victorinus II, 75.

⁶⁴ Ibid, 109.

⁶⁵ Porphyrii philosophi fragmenta ed. A. Smith, BiTeu, Stuttgart/Leipzig 1993; the justification there XIII.

one now knows. "Disons en passant qu'il faut d'ailleurs toujours s'attendre à ce que les auteurs latins de cette époque-là utilisent littéralement des documents grecs, n'en déplaie aux latinistes soucieux de défendre l'originalité des auteurs latins" (p. 121b). The new source evidence prompts Hadot to survey the three groups of philosophical texts that Victorinus must have used (pp. 122a-123a). In the course of this survey, he finds allusions to the exposé in several places in Victorinus, including in adv. Ar. III 7, a passage that I have already referred to above. Admittedly, the exposé "cannot fully explain the philosophical content" of the three groups of sources: not the elements in Group I that are to be regarded as Porphyrian, not the numerous terms or expressions from the Chaldean oracles in Groups I and III (p. 123a). "L'œuvre de Victorinus reste donc encore bien mystérieuse" (p. 123b).

[549] Finally, Hadot asks whether the exposé reached Victorinus without an intermediate stage (p. 123b below). He finds that if it were not for the fact that it was used by the author of "Zostrianus" *and* the knowledge of this revelation in Plotinus' school, the exposé could just as well be post-Plotinian as Middle Platonic in terms of content. Plotinus also knew affirmative theology; however, he would not have allowed a formula such as "idea of himself/herself".

"The great problem that the text" of the exposé "poses" remains *πνεῦμα/spiritus* as the term for the supreme principle in both the Latin and the Coptic text (p. 124a). The problem in this form disappears under my translation, see above. But did *πνεῦμα* perhaps not occur at all in its original Greek form in the exposé? (p. 124b). In the first part of the text, on the Coptic page (Zostrianus 64,17), we find right at the beginning the identification between the One and the Spirit (see Tardieu's explanations on p. 62a), which is not present on the Latin page. (How well the identification fits into the overall style of "Zostrianus" can be seen from Tardieu's compilations at the place indicated).

In the event that Victorinus received the exposé in a Christian Gnostic tradition, namely "rencontrée chez un auteur chrétien, *défenseur du consubstantiel*"⁶⁶ - this is Hadot's sensational, hypothetical conclusion from Tardieu's references to the role of Gnostics in the anti-Arian disputes - it would be explainable that Victorinus did not recognize the Gnostic aspect in it. Hadot, as already mentioned, considers the "Gnostic" aspect in Victorinus (nevertheless) to be a phenomenon that has not yet been explained (p. 125); I believe that he himself and Tardieu have provided us with the key to the explanation: One must extend the inference just quoted to the whole material of Gnostic thoughts and phrases. I will return to this below.

"Jusqu' à nouvel ordre", Hadot says in conclusion, he continues to believe that the fragments of the Parmenides commentary are by Porphyrius and that numerous phi-

⁶⁶ My emphasis.

losophical texts in Victorinus are also of Porphyrian origin. A Middle Platonic source is very probably to be assumed for the newly prepared text. "Le mystère de Victorinus n'en est pas résolu pour autant; il s'obscurcit même, je crois, un peu plus." In view of his advanced age, he leaves the problems to others and refers to Seneca (p. 125).

In the same year as Tardieu/Hadot, 1996, an essay was published by Chiara Ombretta Tommasi, *Tripotens in unalitate spiritus: Mario Vittorino e la Gnosi*⁶⁷. The author could not yet have been aware of our review volume. Her interest in the cited formulation lies [550] not in *spiritus*, but in *tri- potens*. Tommasi begins with a compilation of the passages with *tripotens*: Adv. Ar. I 50,4; 50,11; 52,3; IV 21,26; finally she cites "the complicated digression on the soul (I 56,3 ff.)"; towards the end of her essay she will say of this passage that I and Majercik⁶⁸ have given it too little consideration (73 f.). The hypothesis that Tommasi wants to put forward is: "che Mario Vittorino avesse *letto di prima mano dei testi gnostici*", from which some elements are found "filtered and reused" in his theological writings, alongside concepts that come from philosophy (53). Given the uniqueness of the person and work of Victorinus in the panorama of Latin religious writers, these peculiarities are not surprising (53). Tommasi of course mentions the mention of Valentinus (54 f.) in adv. Ar. I 16 (I have said above that this point must be distinguished from the other Gnostic phenomena in Victorinus). "L'immagine del dio tripotente ... sarebbe ... derivata a Mario Vittorino direttamente della letterature gnostica", albeit reworked. Such a characterization of the deity is, as far as can be seen, the first (and almost the only one) in the Latin world and likewise in the Greek, hence the need for a new thorough investigation (56). *τριδύναμος*/*tripotens* is a rather rare vocabulary, in almost all non-gnostic cases applied to the soul (57); but one has once in Augustin, *De ordine* II 5,51, *tripotentem patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum* (58)⁶⁹. Because of Hadot's earlier references to the Chaldean oracles on this topic, Tommasi first discusses the meaning of *τριοὔχος* and then also of *τριφυής* and *τριγλῶχis*, *τρικόρυμνος* in the Neoplatonic literature, which may have something to do with oracle exegesis (58-60). However, for *τριδύναμος* itself a gnostic derivation is certain (61).

Among the Gnostics, the word appears many times and is used almost formulaically. It can refer both to the supreme deity and to subordinate entities, without it being possible to establish an "exact casuistry". We know from Hippolytus and Theodoret that the gods attribute the threefold power to Christ.

⁶⁷ Koinonia (Naples) 20, 1996, 53-75.

⁶⁸ See above on Tardieu 19-26.

⁶⁹ This line is not cut out correctly; I will quote the section in Augustin quote and discuss in context.

ben (τριφυῆ, τρισωμον, τριδύναμον). According to Ps. Jerome, *Indiculus de haeresibus* (PL 81, 640b), the Sethians call the supreme power, "identificabile con il secondo principio transcendente, e dunque col Cristo", *trivirtus* (62). In the Pistis Sophia and the Anonymus Brucianus, with their endless multiplications of entities, the threefold power is attributed to both evil aeons and beneficent forces, "esseri misteriosi" and symbols of divine power. In the Pistis Sophia "il rapporto è pur sempre di subordinazione" (63). In the Anon. Bruc. the supreme god can also be called τριδύναμος; [551] the final prayer calls him "the triune of light", who presides over other triune deities. Both writings have no philosophical background (64).

In the *Apocryphon Johannis* and in the *Protennoia trimorphos*, one subordinate deity is meant in each case. In Marsanes, the third of the three supreme beings is "uno invisibile dai tre potere". The three-powered One in this scripture is "caratterizzato dall' azione (ἐνέργεια) e ha proprietà salvifiche e demiurgiche, e, da ultimo, si presenta come rivelato dall' uno preesistente", thus approaching the characterization of Christ as endowed with three powers in Perates and Sethians.

Marsanes, Allogenes, the Three Stelae of Seth, Zostrianus are considered to be more philosophical than Christian⁷⁰, the philosophical background is Middle Platonic, they are all Sethian or Barbelognostic. They also share the literary form of revelation or apocalypse (64 f.). Most references to the problem under discussion can be found in the Allogenes. In its last part, Revelation concentrates on the noetic triad and finally on the One. Tommasi wants to look here at the chapters in which the triad of existence, life and thought unfolds; these are the chapters in which Allogenes differs from other Gnostic apocalypses. The triune invisible spirit appears several times; it is not always a subordinate variable, but is equated with the highest power. "Il fatto che questo Tripotente Uno sia identificabile perfettamente con il Primo principio si rivela notevole perché in Vittorino è proprio Dio ad essere 'tripotens'".

The invisible and silent One remains undifferentiated, while the three-powerful One unfolds in the three aspects of ὑπαρξίς, ζωή and νοῦς. It is not a generative process, "but a continuum within reality" (67 f.). The relationship of Christ to the Father in Victorinus could be influenced by this. Concerning the triad of being, life, thinking, one must reckon with the simultaneity ("compresenza") of different formulations in Coptic (68 f.). The fluctuation of the different terms for the triad characterizes the unsystematic and not purely philosophical character of this writing (70)⁷¹.

⁷⁰ This is an effect intended by the authors.

⁷¹ In a passage (70-72) on the abstracta ὀντότης etc. used by Victorinus, Tommasi can ὀντότης in Alexander of Aphrodisias, 70 note 67; Hadot had considered whether Porphyrius might have coined the term. - In adv. ar. III 7,9-12, quoted by Tommasi (72), there is even

In contrast to the Greek Neoplatonic authors, Marius Victorinus alternates between *beatitudo* and *intelligentia* in the triad. Tommasi⁷² does not consider Hadot's explanation of this phenomenon to be [552] convincing (72 f.). Rather, the alternation between *beatitudo* and *intelligentia* is characteristic of the NH writings she discusses (73). Finally, Tommasi turns to the beginning of adv. ar. I 56. Here the *tripotens spiritus* is said to have created the *substantia* of the soul, which is different from his own. It relates to him like an echo to *vox* or *verbum*, it is more *imago vocis* than *vox*. This is followed associatively by the reference to the Baptist as *vox exclamans in deserto* and the application to the soul as being in the desert of the world. Tommasi mentions Hadot's references to Heracleon's exegesis, to which these statements are reminiscent. "Dunque, anche in questo caso lo 'spiritus tripotens' potrebbe essere una reminiscenza gnostica" (74).

If, despite some "ambiguità", gnosis is determined to be Victorinus' "excellent source", then Hadot's problem with the derivation of the trinitarian spirit in Victorinus would be resolved; in any case, the expression could not be derived from Porphyrius' oracle exegesis (74 f.).

Following this discussion of Tommasi's essay, I must return to the Augustinian line she quoted with *tripotens* (see above on Tommasi 58). If one reads Augustin, the quotation turns out not to have been cut out quite correctly; the punctuation of the editor W. M. Green in CChr. SL 29 is not innocent of this. I put Augustin, *De ordine* II 5,16 here and let the counting of the lines run along, to make quoting easier:

(42) *Duplex enim est via, quam sequimur, cum rerum nos* (43) *obscuritas movet, aut rationem aut certe auctoritatem. Philo(44)sophia rationem promittit et vix paucissimi liberat, quos* (45) *tamen non modo non contemnere illa mysteria sed sola intel(46)legere, ut intellegenda sunt, cogit, nullumque aliud habet* (47) *negotium, quae vera et, ut ita dicam, germana philosophia est, (48) quam ut doceat, quod sit omnium rerum principium sine prin(49)cipio quantusque in eo maneat intellectus quidve inde in* (50) *nostram salutem sine ulla degeneratione manaverit, quem* (51) *unum deum omnipotentem eumque tripotentem, patrem et* (52) *filium et spiritum sanctum, docent veneranda mysteria, quae* (53) *fide sincera et inconcussa populos liberant, nec confuse, ut* (54) *quidam, nec contumeliose, ut multi, praedicant. Quantum* (55) *autem illud sit, quod hoc etiam nostri generis corpus tantus* (56) *propter nos deus adsumere atque agere dignatus est, quanto* (57) *videtur vilius, tanto est clementia plenius et a quadam ingenio(58)sorum superbia longe alteque remotius.*

I moved a comma in line 51; Green placed it after *omnipotent*, despite the *eumque*, which makes a comma superfluous. This makes it more *tripotent* than

ὑπαρκτότης (line 12). Tommasi has not found the vocabulary in any Greek writer and considers it to be a neologism of Victorinus.

⁷² In contrast to Majercik.

Adjective to *patrem*. But *eumque* refers *tripotentem* to *deum*, hence my comma *after* this conspicuous vocabulary. The three trinitarian names in turn explicate *tripotentem*. *Tripotentem* is an assonance of *omnipotentem*, which is not recognizable in the quotation from Tommasi. Augustine combines the confession of the one God [553] with that of the Trinitarian God, using the beginning of the Romanum, *Credo in unum deum, patrem omnipotentem*, but rearranging it in the manner quoted. *Tripotentem* is thus given a very prominent position. This is followed shortly afterwards by the statement of the assumption of the body "from our generation" and of the dwelling in it (*agere*). Both together, the monotheistic-trinitarian and the incarnational statement, can be described as an abridged version of the *regula fidei*.

The entire § 16 of *De ordine* II 5 is highly characteristic of the early Augustine in terms of content and structure. The theme is *ratio* and/or *auctoritas*, philosophy and/or faith. Philosophy is also measured in terms of whether it can bring salvation (line 44.50), but "hardly liberates the fewest" (line 44), whereas the doctrine of "Mysteries" (i.e. teaching of the events of salvation) liberates the crowd (*populos*) (line 53 - cross-reference within the train of thought). The task of philosophy is (it has no other *negotium*, line 46 f.) to teach the principle of all things, which in turn has no before, (furthermore) the intellect, which remains in it and what (*quid*) then emerges for our salvation without any diminution (*degeneratio*) (play on words *manere/manare*). In Christian terms, this is expressed in the underlined lines. Unlike the doctrine of God, no philosophical equivalent can be found for the acceptance of the human body by "such a God" and the dwelling in it; on the contrary, it is far removed from the *superbia* of the intellectually astute (i.e. the Neoplatonists), since it is only contemptible for them. But the more contemptible it is, the greater is the *clementia* (of God) that expresses itself in it.

Pierre Courcelle would like to trace back to Simplician the idea expressed here and repeatedly by Augustin that the incarnation of the Logos, i.e. John 1:14, constitutes the actual difference to the teaching of the Neoplatonists⁷³. Simplician is also the only possible source for the conspicuous *tripotens* in Augustine's *De ordine*, as Simplician had been "intimately acquainted" with Marius Victorinus in Rome⁷⁴. Like Victorinus, Simplician and therefore also Augustine were not aware or familiar with the Gnostic origin of the adjective on which Tommasi insists. It is probably no coincidence that the vocabulary occurs in one of Augustine's earliest writings; it is generally dated to 386, together with *Contra Academicos* and *De beata vita*, i.e. after the conversion but before the baptism (387) of its author. Courcelle

⁷³ P. Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin*, Paris 1950, 173 and notes; on Simplician and the extent of his influence on Augustin 168-174.

⁷⁴ Augustin, conf. VIII 2,3: *Victorinum ipsum recordatus est, quem, Romae cum esset, familiarissime noverat*. Quoted by Courcelle 138 note 1.

notes⁷⁵ that Augustine here already presents the "Catholic doctrine of the Logos" (apart from de ord. II 5,16 he also mentions I 10,29). But what about the allusion to the [554] Baptismal confession and the *veneranda mysteria* (line 52 above in the quotation) and the *fides sincera et inconcussa* (line 53)? Would someone who has not yet been baptized be able or allowed to speak in this way, regardless of how much he already knows about Christian beliefs? Would a somewhat later dating be appropriate?

A late echo in Augustin of the piece of Gnostic exegesis in Marius Victorinus, in which John the Baptist is understood as an allegory of the soul and which can also only be mediated by Simplician, was already found by Hadot in 1950 in conf. VII 9,1376. Conf. VII 9,13 (and the beginning of 14) is an interpretation of John's prologue. In the passage in question, Augustine does not mention the Baptist at all; the soul takes his place immediately and without any justification. Augustine quotes John 1:1-5, but leaves verse 6 with the "man sent by God, whose name was John" and selects the following from verses 7 and 8, which also speak of John: *et quia hominis anima, quamvis "testimonium perhibeat de lumine, non est" tamen "ipsa lumen", sed verbum, deus ipse, "est lumen verum, quod inluminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum"*. - Here, too, in the entire chain of tradition Marius Victorinus - Simplician - Augustin, there is no awareness of an originally Gnostic origin of allegory.

For the fascinating phenomenon of the Gnostic in a Homoousian, Tardieu and Hadot refer in our volume to an essay by Tardieu, published in 1987 in the Festschrift for Claude Mondésert⁷⁷.

Bernhard Rehm had identified an interpolation in one branch of the tradition of the pseudo-Clementine recognitions (III 2-11), preserved in Rufin's Latin translation and in the Syriac translation. Rehm determined this insertion to be Eunomian. Rufin had pointed out in his prologue that one finds in the text *quaedam ... de ingenito deo genitoque disserta ...*, which went beyond his understanding, *ut nihil amplius dicam* (Tardieu, Diatribe 325 f.). For his part, Tardieu identifies the opponents of the Eunomian polemic: supporters of homoousia, "dont les dogmes mettent en danger l'unicité et l'absolue agennésie de l'inengendré". However, the Interpolator does not attack them directly, but under the guise of other heretics, namely Gnostics (326-328). The plan of the Eunomian interpolation is best compared with that of the Apology of Eunomius. The insertion consists of two parts, the first directed against

⁷⁵ Ibid. 173 note 4.

⁷⁶ Mentioned by Courcelle 173 note 3: P. Hadot, La notion de Dieu "causa sui" chez Marius Victorinus Afer. Unpublished thesis at the Institut Catholique, Paris 1950, 58.

⁷⁷ M. Tardieu, Une diatribe antignostique dans l'interpolation Eunomienne des *Recognitiones*, in: ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΙΝΑ. Hellenisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie. FS Claude Mondésert, Paris 1987, 325-337.

the "ignorance", i.e. the Gnostics, the second against "folly", whose representatives Tardieu calls [555] "modalists". (In his Apology Eunomius names: Sabellius, Markell, Photin). "The defense of the agennesia of the unbegotten presents itself as a methodical investigation of the three names of the triad". "Father" and "Son" are discussed in the first part, the debate about "Spirit" takes place in the second, anti-Sabellian part.

The Gnostics' thesis is presented in this way: For them, the unbegotten is *auto-pator* and *autogennetos* (329). Father and Son form an unbegotten substance. (I pass over Tardieu's presentation of the arguments of the refutation by the interpolator here, but draw *attention* to the anti-Marcellian keyword *non extendens*). While "piety" (i.e. the Eunomian view) calls the substance of the Son "monogenes, firstborn, son", "ignorance" speaks of the generation of the "unbegotten" as *masculo-femina*, i.e. as androgynous (330).

The thesis of "foolishness" and its refutation are intertwined (330); the refutation boils down to the subordination of Son and Spirit. The Apology of Eunomius, which so obviously served as a substantive and literary model for the Interpolator, was written in 360; the insertion has been dated by Rehm to 378.

Where could the interpolator have found the specific Gnostic expressions at that time? And is such an attack by a radical Arian on Gnostics an exception? Tardieu first deals with the termini technici *autopator* and *autogenetos* (331). These are not specifically Gnostic; Porphyrius refers them at one point to the intellect. If the interpolator claims that the opponents refer both words to the ungenerated, this cannot be proven from Gnostic sources; although both termini occur in them, they are distributed over two quantities. From the Syriac translation of the insertion, Tardieu concludes that the second of the terms must have been αὐτογεννήτωρ (active subject). This gives him the opportunity to collect various Gnostic titles on -τωρ in a note (34); among them is a passage in the Eugnostos (NHC III,3 § 8), where *autopator* and *autogennetos* are synonymous (332). It is precisely this passage that Tardieu analyzes in the following plain text: "À la suite de son exposé des attributs négatifs du Père préexistant inengendré (§ 3), Eugnoste décrit l'activité notionnelle du même Père s'apprêtant à sortir de lui-même (§ 8)". In this activity he bears the title *propator*. The Gnostic text says of him: il "se voit lui-même en lui-même comme dans un miroir, s'étant manifesté dans sa ressemblance en tant qu'autopatôr, c'est-à-dire en tant qu'autogenetôr, et vis-à-vis puisqu'en vis-à-vis du préexistant inengendré" 78.

78 Epiphanius, haer. 26,10 (4) reports of the "Barbelites" that they refer to the "Father and Lord of all" as αὐτοπατωρ; they distinguish the αὐτολόχευτος ("self-generated") Christ from "οὐτὸν" Christ.

This section of Eugnostus' letter thus offers both *autopator* and [556] *autogenetor* side by side as two names of the *propator*, the second explaining the first. This is the closest parallel to the assertion of the Eunomian interpolator. Admittedly, the latter omits the *propator*, which Tardieu calls a "nuance" (333), but which I would describe as a coarsening with polemical intent. Just compare how differentiated the relationship between the three variables of the Gnostic text is in Tardieu's explanation (334 above).

Tardieu then deals with the third terminus technicus, which the interpolator communicates: *periclitantur enim filii impiorum pie se putantes intellegere, magnam blasphemiam ingenito ingerendo, masculofeminam eum existimantes*. Tardieu convincingly demonstrates that from the (gnostic) matter, the context, the Syriac version and the oldest Latin manuscript, it is not *ingenito* but *genito* that should be read. Tardieu then presents the respective subject of the adjective "androgynous" in the Eugnostos in the versions of NHC III,3 and V,1 and in the derivative, the "Sophia Jesu Christi" (in the Berlin Gnostic Codex): It is in no case the *propator*. "L'interpolateur eunomien n'a donc pas commis d'erreur en attribuant aux mêmes hérétiques qui qualifiaient le Père d'*autopator* et *autogenetor*, une doctrine selon laquelle l'entité médiane engendrée est dite 'andro- gyne'. C'est bien les gnostiques qui sont visés, et la *Lettre d'Eugnoste* en particulier" (334 f.). "La lutte antignostique restait un sujet d'actualité chez les ariens", even among those of the second generation (335). In note 46, Tardieu adds that in this they followed their founder, Arius, who attacked Valentin, Marcion and Mani in his letter to Alexander of Alexandria. - But in this letter (Urk. 6 in Opitz), Arius does not attack the heretics as such, but insinuates Gnostic consequences of the Trinity doctrine of his bishop and others; one should *not, like Mani*, introduce "the begotten", τὸ γέννημα, i.e. the Son, as μέρος ὁμοούσιον τοῦ πατρὸς (with which Arius, for his part, introduced the disputed adjective into the Trinitarian debate).

Does the Eunomian compilation or synopsis of Gnostics and Nicenes show that these two groups in turn fought *together* against the radical Arians? Tardieu is of this opinion (336); he presents it after describing Aetius' experience with a "Borborian" (335) and recalled Epiphanius' dealings with Egyptian Gnostics (336). But Tardieu's analysis of the Eunomian interpolation does not provide this conclusion. The interpolation *denounces* its Nicene counterpart as gnostic and thus heretical and thus *formally proceeds* like Arius. But unlike Arius, the interpolator does not fall back on the great old heretic names, but works with material that seems particularly interesting to us because it belongs to the field of NH research. What the Interpolator knows, lucky man, is the Greek original (if one can speak of "original" in the case of the Gnostics with their constant edits) of a text that we can only read in Coptic versions from Nag [557] Hammadi. We have here a testimony of the

We have before us the external effect⁷⁹ of a component of literature that has otherwise only been preserved in its double burial in translation and hiding place. And it is an external effect that is later than the compilation of the Coptic translations in those famous codices, but also later than the special phenomenon that confronts us in the "Zostrianus" relationships and the other strange Gnosticisms in Marius Victorinus.

The dispute between a "Borborian" (an insult for the Barbelognosti, see Epiphanius) and Aetius, which Tardieu refers to (335, after Philostorgius, h.e. III 15), shows the initiative on the part of the Gnostic. It is *he* who "engages" ⁸⁰Aetius in an exchange of words about the ἰδία δόξα, the "own opinion" (probably: both of them), and inflicts a crushing defeat on Aetius⁸¹. Since Philostorgius belongs to the same Radicalarian party as Aetius, the story is credible, as it did not serve the Arian's glory. Aetius not only takes the outcome as a personal defeat, but it also depresses him deeply "that the lie is stronger than the truth" ⁸². Unfortunately, we do not learn more about the content of the debate. But we can assume that the respective

The "own view" of the first principles concerned, in Trinitarian terms, the relation of the Son to the essence of the Father. There is nothing to indicate that the Gnostic would also have argued for the Nicene. What remains for us⁸³ is that a Barbelognostic could also be found in Cilicia (and not only in Egypt); and Tardieu's judgment on the abilities of the Gnostic should be noted: "Quand on sait qu' Aèce reste l'inventeur de l'une des machines verbales les plus sophistiquées jamais sortie de la plume d'un écrivain grec (le *Suntagmation*) on est en droit de sup- poser que le gnostique qui triomphe de lui n'était pas un dialecticien dépourvu de talent" (335). This means that the Gnostic opponent of Aetius must also have had a corresponding education. This point of view will be useful for the Roman problems.

From Epiphanius' famous account in the Panarion (26) of Egyptian barbelognostics, we know that he was almost won over by them as a young man (his not insignificant embarrassment about this comes to light again and again). He lived among them, learned their customs and teachings (I leave the veracity of his descriptions of their practices open to question) and read their writings. Was it the reading that [558] opened his eyes? In any case, Epiphanius' relationship with these people ended with him denouncing them to the bishops. He found out how many of them were "hiding in the church": About 80 people

⁷⁹ See Tardieu's characterization of the Eügnostos letter, 335: "Pensée et écrite pour les gens du dehors, la lettre connut une large diffusion".

⁸⁰ GCS Philostorgius 46.16 f. Bidez/Winkelmann.

⁸¹ Ibid. Line 17.

⁸² Line 18 f.

⁸³ Line 15.

were expelled from the city⁸⁴. - We may therefore conclude that the Gnostics encountered Epiphanius as church Christians. If we take the information that Epiphanius founded a monastery in Palestine at the age of about 20 (in the second half of the thirties of the 4th century) as a basis, then his stay in Egypt falls into the early period of Athanasius' episcopate, whether before or after the Synod of Tyre in 335 cannot be decided. However, one does not have the impression that Athanasius' dispute with Arius was of any relevance to the Egyptian community in which Epiphanius was staying. The problem of the relationship of one of the parties in the Trinitarian dispute to representatives or teachings of the Gnostics does not yet arise here. However, it should be noted that the local bishop was not sufficiently aware of the internal circumstances in his church to feel compelled to intervene before Epiphanius took action.

The Eunomian interpolator of the pseudo-Clementan recognitions, on the other hand, recognized his literary source as a gnostic one, which is why he used it for his antinicene (or anti-Marcian) purposes in the first place.

Aetius' opponent is called a Gnostic of a certain school of thought by an insulting name. But did one of them *not consider* himself a member of the church? Is this perhaps a dispute between the only two intellectuals in the town who were up to the subject?

Epiphanius, on the other hand, did not realize at first that the group of Christians in the Egyptian city who were trying to find him represented secret special teachings. His great youth at the time may excuse him; he soon proved himself to be a denouncer, as already mentioned.

None of these cases, all from the 4th century, is in itself fully comparable with the case of Marius Victorinus, none of them exhibits the peculiar constellation that we find in Marius Victorinus. But let us consider another point of contact.

Let us take the relationship to the local bishop (see Epiphanius). The rhetorician Victorinus, who had converted to Christianity, had Bishop Liberius of Rome (352-366) as his exact contemporary. Both are defenders of Niceneism. Indeed, the fate of Liberius clearly shows how acutely the Trinitarian controversy affected the Roman Church in those years. Liberius had to pay for his support of Athanasius with exile under Emperor Constantius (356); there he was forced to sign anti-Nicene formulations. He was then able to return to Rome in 358, but found an opposing bishop there [559]. In the following years until his death, Liberius' official statements were in Pronicene.

As far as I can see, the contemporaneity of the rhetor and the bishop was first discussed by Jörg Ulrich in his book on the incipient reception of the Nicaeus.

⁸⁴ GCS Epiphanius I, 298,12-18 Holl/Dummer.

nums in the West⁸⁵. Erich Caspar does not even mention Victorinus in the chapter on the pontificate of Liberius. The contrast in the intellectual make-up of these two representatives of Roman Niceneism could not be greater. Liberius "hardly ever left any traces of theological argumentation. Only towards the end of his life do we find a few dogmatic statements from his mouth" (Ulrich 231). "For all his commitment to questions of church politics and law, and despite his important role in the growing importance of the Roman See in the progress of the controversies, Liberius was obviously not very committed theologically" (233). His attitude towards a delegation of Homoëusian bishops in 366 was initially hostile and betrays his "complete ignorance of Oriental theology" (237). While

"the nineocene solution had long been under discussion by a theologian like Marius Victorinus", there is no hint of it in the Pope's letter "on the occasion of the acceptance of the Homœusians into church communion with the West" (240 f.).

Should we not assume that the bishop himself would have performed the baptism on such a prominent person as Marius Victorinus? But we hear nothing of this; however, Liberius was at the Synod of Milan in 355 and had to go into exile in 356, so he could have been absent at the time of the baptism. This leaves us with the only known relationship with Simplician as a representative of the Church institution.

While Epiphanius, himself a Christian, found the secret barbelognostics "in the church", Victorinus, the non-Christian, came to Christianity and the church *from outside*. And while the milieu into which the curious Epiphanius had entered does not exactly make an intellectual impression (was this the intention of Epiphanius' description?), even though they had their own literature, the Christian group in Rome, in which Victorinus was able to inform himself about the new religion, must have had a different character; in it an exchange of ideas was possible on a considerable level, even if Victorinus was probably more talented than the other members of the group.

In the absence of other documents, the only source for the Roman Christian background of Marius Victorinus' theology is his own writings. From the fact that he is not aware of the gnostic character of the much-discussed gnostic phrases in his works (that Valentin was to be condemned, he [560] probably only knows from a synodal text available to him), it must be concluded that they were not marked as gnostic by anyone, regardless of whether they came to him orally or in writing.

Nor did the tradents refer to themselves as Gnostics, nor were they given one of the Gnostic (insulting) names by others to Victorinus

⁸⁵ J. Ulrich (see note 36) on Liberius 231-245, on Marius Victorinus 244-263.

has been. This distinguishes the phenomenon of Marius Victorinus entirely from the three examples from the 4th century discussed above. Nevertheless, Hadot's and Tardieu's intuition gained from these is correct and only requires further application⁸⁶. In my opinion, *all gnostic components in Victorinus and the exposé can be traced back to one and the same tradition*⁸⁷ ; and this tradition cannot be literarily detached from the source of his Nicene theology. I thus postulate that the resolute Nicene scholars with whom the rhetorician who was becoming a Christian had to deal were, according to his writings, *ecclesiastically assimilated Gnostics to the highest degree*. The exposé in the form in which it was presented to Marius Victorinus allows a more precise determination: they were Barbelo-Gnostics, firstly because of the cross-relation to the Barbelognostic "Zostrianus", secondly because of the leading fossil *tripotens*, in whose evaluation as Barbelognostic I agree with Tommasi. Apart from this appropriation of *tripotens*, however, Tardieu's characterization of the exposé as *non-gnostic* remains valid.

But why did this group in Rome merge into Niceneism? Was this the effect of the Arians' denunciation of the Nicenes as Gnostic-like? Did the radical Arians' synopsis have such an effect on the Gnostics themselves that they adapted to the hostile image in a completely unexpected way? (In that it was not the Nicenes who became Gnostics, but the Barbelognostics - in Rome at any rate - Nicenes!) What role does the memory play that ὁμοούσιος was used by Gnostics long before, not just by Mani? Tertullian knew it, as we know, as a Gnostic terminus technicus, translated by him as *consubstantivus* or *consubstantialis*. Now it was used without difficulty in a Christian-trinitarian context.

A key passage for this could be the quotation about the first tetrad from the teaching of *clarus magister* in Irenaeus, haer. I 11,3. While in the paper on the Ptolemaic myths in haer. I 5 ὁμοούσιος is used for the relationships in the lower realm of cosmogony - homoousia of the πνευματικά emerging from the Achamoth with this their origin or the ψυχικά among themselves - homoousia is found in the *clarus magister* in the realm of the first principles. In the Latin translation, the Greek adjective *eiusdem* stands for *sub[561]stantiae*. The tetrad consists of four different vocabulary words for unity and one (retained in the translation in the Greek form), arranged in pairs; the second pair emerges from the first, homoousia is mentioned on this second level.

⁸⁶ I have already made a preliminary reference to this above (on Tardieu/Hadot p. 125).

⁸⁷ Tommasi's judgment that Victorinus had direct access to individual Gnostic writings must therefore be modified.

προαρχή = μονότης / δύναμις = ένότης
 άρχή = μονάς / δύναμις όμοούσιος = έννν

One would like to assume that something like a barbelognostic school with a corresponding textual tradition persisted in Rome for over a hundred years. They were also Christian in Plotinus' time, although their writings at the time tried to appear as non-Christian as possible (with which they were successful with some modern scholars) in order to be accepted by the Neoplatonic, anti-Christian philosophers. The people with whom Marius Victorinus is now dealing have assimilated in the opposite direction (does the changed religious-political situation play a role in this?) But their strong philosophical interest seems to have remained. Perhaps Victorinus even came across these Christians among the philosophers with whom he undoubtedly socialized? The transition to decidedly ecclesiastical Christianity is made possible for the group by renouncing the pre-secular drama of the Gnostic myth. Instead, the Christian doctrine of the Trinity is represented in the Nicene form (because of the όμοούσιος?!). Within the doctrine of the Trinity, a peculiar logostheology⁸⁸ was developed (or retained?), to which I drew attention above. It was not completely in line with church doctrine. Victorinus' relativization of his statements about the suffering of the Creator-Logos on/in creation probably attempted to remedy this. He was apparently not prepared to delete these statements altogether because of their systemic character. The interesting passage adv. Ar. IV 31,31-5389, where at the end the origin of ύλη is mentioned with reference to other accounts, without any qualifying vocabulary, suggests that he argued in the "many books" and "elsewhere" without such relativizations. Did he (Simplician?) first have to be made aware of their necessity? [562] The doctrine of the Logos is the *only coherent* intellectual complex that we can identify, apart from the exposé, for the theology of this particular Roman Nicene.

So, if my suggestion is correct, the Roman Barbelognostics underwent an astonishing development in the long period of their existence. At the time of Marius Victorinus, they were truly "in the church", but in a completely different sense from the Gnostics, whom Epiphanius expelled from the local church.

⁸⁸ It is worth recalling the Christian Gnostic logostheology that characterizes the editor of the Gnostic Sondergut in Hippolytus. With its help, he covers his diverse material with a unifying interpretation. L. Abramowski, A Gnostic Logostheologian. Scope and editor

The objections that J. Mansfeld raises against my work, also referring to those of others, are not valid (Heresiography in Context. Hippolytus' *Elenchos* as a Source for Greek Philosophy, Leiden 1992, 320 f.).

⁸⁹ Above at notes 35-39.

They had been absorbed into the church. Their existence can only be deduced from the writings of Marius Victorinus; and conversely, they are probably what made the rhetorician a Nicene Christian.

Addendum

In adv. Ar. IV 29, a section that Hadot titles "Rapport consubstantial entre pensée intérieure et pensée de la pensée" (= God and the Son), there is a curious text in which the word pair πλήρωμα - χώρημα appears; in addition, there is talk of the "searching" of the pleroma. In this context, χώρημα is of course an antithesis to the deuteropauline πλήρωμα. Before I continue with this passage, it is worthwhile, as always, to follow Hadot's cross-references: Cand. I 11,17; adv. ar. I 13,17; 24,44-48; 37,24-26.

Cand. I 11,17. From lines 14-19: *omnium quae sunt ... praeprincipium aut praecausa et praestatio et effector, capacitas, plenitudo, per quem effecta sunt omnia et sine quo nihil, salvator noster, universorum emendatio*. - The Savior, the Creator, is the

"containing" "fullness" (of the created). *Capacitas* for χώρημα only here, translated by Hadot as "réceptacle" in analogy to the parallel passages. The pair of terms is not derived; it is evidently part of Victorinus' familiar intellectual arsenal (the letter of "Candidus" was written by Victorinus himself).

Adv. ar. I, 13,17. lines 14-18: *Filius, ut esset, accepit et in id quod est agere, ab actione procedens in perfectionem veniens, motu efficitur plenitudo, factus omnia quae sunt ("étant devenu tous les existants"). Sed quoniam in ipso et in ipsum et per ipsum gignuntur omnia, semper plenitudo et semper receptaculum est; quia ratione et impassibilis et passibilis*. - Victorinus will retain the translation of χώρημα with *receptaculum* from now on. It is interesting that the word pair is paralleled with "suffering-unable and suffering-capable", even providing the reason for the latter pair. Here, too, the "fullness" means that which was created by the Son, just as he is also its receptacle. A few lines earlier (line 6 f.), the Son is called *totus ex toto et lumen ex lumine*, "expressions from confessions that were dear to the Homœusians", namely that of the Church Synod and Sirmium 351 (Hadot SC 69, 753). Hadot also mentions the proximity of these formulations to "fullness/vessel" in adv. Ar. IV 29.

[563] Adv. ar. I 24,44-48. lines 19-29 quote Col 1,15-20 (*plenitudo* in verse 19 of the Deutero-Pauline text). The quotation is immediately preceded by one of the statements that both state and relativize the Logos' ability to suffer, line 17 f.: *et patitur et passibilis est vel potius passibilis dicitur*. After the quotation from Colossians, Victorinus gives an evaluation of his argumentation (directed against the Homœusians). It turns out that Victorinus, contrary to our custom, *does not* understand the "fullness" of Col 1:19 as the "fullness of the Godhead" according to Col 2:9, but as the fullness of what is described in verse 16, i.e. of the created. This is the interpretation presupposed in cand. I 11 and adv. ar. I 13, as we have seen. Grammatically

This interpretation is possible, the question is whether it corresponds to the theological style of the text. It is rather the "fullness (of the Godhead)" that enables the Son to carry out the task of reconciliation and pacification in Col 1:20; the passage quoted above from Cand. I quoted above refers to this verse as *Salvator noster, universorum emendatio*, but in the sense of Victorinus, as it follows from what has been said so far. Adv. Ar. I 24,44 f. immediately confirms this: *λόγος enim et causa est ad id quod est esse his quae sunt et est receptaculum eorum quae in ipso sunt*. But at the same time, the "vessel" is also "*plenitudo*", as in the next sentence, lines 46-48: *Quod autem omnia in ipso, ipsum receptaculum completur* ("est rempli") *omnibus quae sunt et ipsum est et plenitudo, et idcirco omnia per ipsum* (etc.). In the interest of the homoousia of father and son, the father is included in the *plenitudo* in the next chapter, I 25,2-4: *... si non ὁμοούσιον quomodo et pater plenitudo, et filius? Simul enim omnia plenitudo* ("Car la plénitude, c'est toutes choses ensemble"). It would be absurd to speak of this "fullness" on the condition of an ὁμοούσιον (line 4 f.). - Finally, Col 2:9 is also quoted, I 25:27 f., with the following explanation (28 f.): *hoc est in operatione substantialiter*, "c'est ainsi que Victorinus comprend *corporaliter*" (SC 69, 779). - All this means that the Son of the Logos is both *plenitudo* and *receptaculum* in a double sense: fullness of what he has created and fullness of the Godhead, vessel of what has been created and vessel of the Godhead.

Adv. Ar. I 37,24-26. These lines belong to a larger context in which we find ourselves "définitivement dans la théologie des prépositions ou des syllabes, comme dirait Saint Basile" (SC 69, 813). The discussion of *ex quo omnia* and *in quo omnia* gives Victorinus the opportunity to draw on the word pair "container-fullness", although this is not compelling for the desired conclusion. Lines 22-28: Everything is from the Father, even the Son. This is the *proprium* of the Father. The Son's *proprium* is this: *in quo omnia, quod λόγος et locus est* (silly or witty play on words, depending on taste). *Factorum enim et operum per semet ipsum ipse est receptaculum. Ibi autem existentibus omnibus quae sunt, efficitur plenitudo*. Jesus is the "Father" of all works that are through him. *Unum ergo pater et filius*. (On Jesus as Father, see below).

Finally adv. ar. IV 29,9-18 (with line 25 and IV 30,31). In this part, the word pair appears in its Greek form: *Sic ergo filius* [564] *... intellexit deum et omnia illa quae ingenita deus sunt, et intelligendo, πλήρωμα quaerendo et πλήρωμα intelligendo* ("et 'en pensant' signifie: en cherchant le plérôme et en pensant le plérôme" - but is πλήρωμα a grammatical object here? See below). *Unde enim extitit quod pater. Etenim, cum πλήρωμα pater sit, necessario χώρημα suum habet infinitum, licet et sibi finitum, ubi πλήρωμα suum tenet et capit, eodemque modo filius, recipiendo et quaerendo - hoc est enim recipere, χώρημα existere intellegendo autem totum quod pater est, πλήρωμα extitit genitus et ipse totus ex toto*.

Neither from the long text Col 1,15-20 nor from Col 2,9 can the use of χώρημα be derived linguistically; the noun does not occur there, and no verb form suggests the noun formation. And we hear about the "searching" of the pleroma

nothing at all. Nor is it required by Victorinus' train of thought. In the case of oddities in connection with *pleroma*, it is advisable to consult Irenaeus. The Ptolemaic *pleroma*, described in haer. I 1,1, is evidence of the fascination the word exerted. The first quantity in it after the pair *Bythos* - *Sige* and produced by it is the *Nous*, which is the father

"similar and equal" is καὶ μόνον χωροῦντα τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ πατρός (I 1,1, SC 264, 30/31). Here, after all, we have the *verb* χωρεῖν. The Ptolemaic *nous* has the name *Monogenes* - in Marius Victorinus *nous* and *logos* coincide (but not in the Ptolemaic *pleroma*). The Ptolemaic *Logos*, which emerged from *Monogenes*, is called "father" like the latter, namely *omnium eorum qui post se futuri essent*, he is ἀρχή and μόρφωσις (*formatio*) παντὸς τοῦ πληρώματος. Cf. above the end of the long confession in Victorinus, adv. Ar. I 47: *Logos ... Jesus Christ ... patrem omnis creaturae et salvatorem*; also in Victorinus, adv. Ar. I 37,26-28 (see above): *Etenim et Iesus, pater est omnium operum, eorum quae per semet ipsum*.

Adv. haer. I 2,1: The Propator can only be recognized by the one born = *Nous*, who has "become of him". The latter wants the other aeons to share in the greatness of the Father, but the "silence" prevents him from doing so according to the will of the Father, *quoniam vellet omnes hos in intellectum et desiderium exquisitionis patris suae adducere* (εἰς ἔννοιαν καὶ πόθον ζητήσεως ... ἀναγαγεῖν). This is what the other aeons "desire", ἡσυχῇ πως, "in some way serene" (SC 264, 36/37) - πως, because desire and serenity do not usually belong together. *Sophia* will then not muster the composure, the "seeking", *exquisitio* of the Father becomes "suffering" (i.e. passion), πάθος instead of πόθος: τὸ δὲ πάθος εἶναι ζήτησιν τοῦ πατρός. The (futile) search aims to τὸ μέγεθος αὐτοῦ καταλαβεῖν (SC 264, 38/39). καταλαμβάνειν is a synonym of χωρεῖν. The unfortunate *exquisitio patris* is mentioned again in I 3,1 (SC 264, 48/49). - According to these observations on Irenaeus' discourse, it is clear that all aeons, i.e. the *pleroma*, are to come to understanding and searching. Therefore Victorinus, [565] adv. Ar. IV 29,11 f. in the colon πλήρωμα *quaerendo* et πλήρωμα, the *pleroma* must be taken as the grammatical *subject* (in correction of Hadot's translation quoted above).

In adv. Haer. I 3,4 (SC 264, 56/57) Irenaeus lists biblical passages with which the Ptolemies want to prove that the "Savior" ἐκ πάντων ὄντα τὸ πᾶν εἶναι. The first passage, Lk 2,23/ Ex 13,2 can only be used with the help of an allegory, Irenaeus gives its *pleromatic* elements. The following *Florileg* from Pauline or deuteropauline formulations looks like this (also in Greek):

Col 3,11 *et ipse est omnia*;

Rm 11,36 *omnia in ipsum, et ex ipsum omnia*;

Col 2,9 *in ipso habitat omnis plenitudo divinitatis* - one notices that the adverb σωματικῶς, *corporaliter*, is well gnostically omitted;

Eph 1,10 *recapitulata esse omnia in Christo per deum*.

Here, too, we find ourselves to a certain extent in a "theology of prepositions and syllables" (see above).

The "Savior", *salvator*, σωτήρ, whom the Ptolemies call "also Christ and Logos patronymice", *et omnia, quoniam ab omnibus esset* (I 2,6; SC 264, 48/49), is within their system the "second Christ" (I 3,1; 50/51). "Everything", from which he was brought forth, is the *pleroma* that has been pacified and unified again after the drama of Sophia and the elimination of matter (*all* aeons are now Nous, Logos, Anthropos etc., analogous to the female aeons; I 2,6; 46/47).

Victorinus certainly did not draw all these Gnostic echoes from the source of Irenaeus; the fact that the form χώρημα is missing there speaks against it. Hadot wonders about Victorinus, *adv. Ar. IV 29,9-18* (SC 69, 1044), whether πλήρωμα - χώρημα "ne sont pas des termes employés dans une profession de foi, car ils sont traités ici de la même manière que *deus de deo* ou *lumen de lumine*". I regard the neighborhood rather as a resumption and condensation of what is said in *adv. ar. I 13,6 f.* and lines 14-18 (see above). Hadot also mentions line IV 29,25 with the said pair of words in the quoted passage of his commentary from the continuation in Victorinus. The passage works towards the homoousia of *lumen* and *lumen* (line 27) and even of *imago* and *imago* (sic! line 26). Because of Gen 1:26, *ad imaginem nostram*, *imago* is used not only for the Son, but also for the Father. In this sense, *uterque χώρημα et πλήρωμα* is to be understood. In IV 30,31 f. we then find the series χώρημα, πλήρωμα, *imago*, *lumen verum*, *veritas*, *spiritus*, *motus*, *actio*, *operatio*, *vita*: all this is in God in a hidden way, belongs to the Son in a revealed way (lines 29-31). - The principle of the homoousia of Father and Son cannot be taken any further if even the Father is described as a "vessel" because the Son functions as such.

Victorinus must owe both the closeness and the great difference to the Ptolemaic Pleroma to his Greek-writing guarantors [566]. The names of the original Gnostic authors (see also the examples from Heracleon in the list of Gnostic material in Tardieu pp. 10b-11b) could not have been included in the material offered to him. This makes it all the more ironic that Victorinus condemns Valentinus on the one hand, while unsuspectingly adopting *topoi* from Valentin's disciples on the other.

Adv. Ar. IV also makes a contribution to the doctrine of the Logos who suffers in the created, 8,2-8: ... *perspiciamus in his in quibus est una eademque substantia, cur alter mittentis, alter missi potestatem gerant, imperantis alter, alter ministri, alter motu agendi a passionibus libero, alter per infinitos actus in creandis saeculis infinitis, et his quae sunt in saeculis, subierit usque ad mortem, innumeras passiones*. - The sufferings of the Son in his cosmogonic functions are innumerable, countless: he has undergone infinite acts of creation of infinite eons until death. In this enumeration of suffering in a continuous line there is no expression of relativization, otherwise it would also have had to relativize the suffering of death. There is no doubt that the passages with the relativization

The definition of the suffering of creation as compared to this original version is a secondary theological correction by Victorinus, for which he had to separate the areas of suffering from one another in the presentation⁹⁰.

⁹⁰ The author would like to thank the staff of the chair of Prof. Marksches in Heidelberg for their writing work. After completion of the manuscript, Matthias Baltes (died 21. 1. 2003) published in 2002: Marius Victorinus. Zur Philosophie in seinen Theologischen Schriften, BZA 174, Leipzig/Stuttgart 2002.

5.8 Concilium Ephesenum - 431

A *sacra* of the emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian III of 19 November 430 summoned a synod to Ephesus for Pentecost (7 June) 431 aimed at the "investigation" and "examination" of "ecclesiastical and related public matters." The synod was supposed to reach a definition (τύπος) based on a common vote; until then no innovation was undertaken "by a few on their own (ἰδίᾳ) "¹. The initiative for a general synod came from Nestorius who wished to appeal to the judgement of the bishops against his condemnation by Rome and Alexandria. The latter two were the addressees of the prohibition in the imperial decree. Nestorius and Cyril both had informed their Roman colleague of their quarrel and supplied documentary evidence. It was Cyril who succeeded in convincing bishop Celestine and his synod of the heresy of the bishop of Constantinople. Rome then entrusted the Alexandrian with the "unprecedented "² task to carry out the Roman judgement. This implied the formulation of a confession in line with the faith of the churches of Rome and Alexandria to be signed by Nestorius. Cyril composed the "very Alexandrian" 12 *anathemata* (*capitula*)³ which are found at the end of the letter from the Egyptian synod to Nestorius. These sentences caused great offense among the "Antiochene" theologians of the diocese Oriens and "alienated them from Cyril for good "⁴. The letter (the third one from Cyril to Nestorius) was delivered to the addressee on 30 November 430; Nestorius did not sign it.

In Ephesus, in early summer 431, the arrival of the Eastern bishops was delayed, and that of the Roman legates even more so; but when John of Antioch, while underway, managed to inform Cyril of the day of his arrival, calculated in days of travel, Cyril decided not to wait and instead inaugurated the (incomplete) council on 22 June 431, against the collective protest of 68 bishops and the imperial official responsible for the correct procedure of the convention. Not only did the participants heap abuse on

[74] and throw out the bishops delegated by Nestorius, but even the *comes* received no better treatment - he was told that he was not to partake of their decisions⁵. Compared with the instructions from the emperor, Cyril's inauguration of the council was illegal, a singular occurrence among the oecumenical synods⁶. The synod thus inaugurated was but a partial council, as was in consequence the synod convoked by John of

¹ *Collectio Vaticana* (= *V*) 25, ACO I 1,1,114-16.

² A. de Halleux, "Nestorius: histoire et doctrine", *Irénikon* 66 (1993) 40.

³ A. de Halleux, "Nestorius: histoire et doctrine", *Irénikon* 66 (1993) 40.

⁴ A. de Halleux, "La première session du concile d'Ephèse (22 juin 431)", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 69 (1993) 59.

⁵ *V* 151,3: report of the *comes* Candidianus at the synod of the Eastern bishops on 26 June 431, ACO I 1,5,119-20. Continuation of the report: *V* 151,6,8. After having read out the imperial instruction and his report about the occurrences of 22 June, the *comes* leaves the sessions, *V* 151,10, and the bishops continue their consultations without him. Had the inauguration of the concil been regular with all invited participants present, the procedure would have been the same.

⁶ A. de Halleux, "Nestorius: histoire et doctrine", *Irénikon* 66 (1993) 41.

Antioch on 26 June 431. The course of the first session of the Cyrillic council on 22 June⁷ likewise cast aside all imperial instructions and was held as a trial against Nestorius, according to the agreement between Cyril and Celestine, on the "heresy" of Nestorius and the letter of the Egyptian synod containing the 12 *anathemata*. But even during this trial, the heresy needed to be formally proven; this was achieved thanks to a

"procedure, on which they had obviously agreed beforehand"⁸, by using the Nicene creed as the recognized norm of orthodox doctrine⁹. The second letter of Cyril to Nestorius was read out and, by vote, declared in conformity with the confession of the 318 fathers¹⁰. The answer of Nestorius, which was likewise read out, was voted as opposite to the creed¹¹. Then the reading of Celestine's letter to Nestorius was demanded by acclamation and granted¹². In this section also a reading of the letter of the Egyptian synod is mentioned¹³. But this interrupts the context, which concerns the letter of Celestine¹⁴ and must hence be an interpolation, i. e. the letter would *not* have been read out. The interpolation must be a work of the redaction of the final version of the protocol, which the participants acknowledged as orthodox through their signatures, including the letter with the *anathemata*.

[75] The formal role of the letter and especially of the *anathemata* during the first session is hard to determine¹⁵. The only other mention in the *Gesta* is the next passage which describes the delivery of the letter to Nestorius in Constantinople on 30 November 430¹⁶. Nor do the reports of the Cyrillians on the trial against Nestorius to various addressees ever speak of the *anathemata* by name, not even in the letters to Celestine (in spite of the fact that Nestorius had been required to abjure them)¹⁷. This restraint was no doubt still a late effect of the annoyance of the emperor at the "innovations caused by a few".

⁷ On this session, A. de Halleux, "La première session du concile d'Ephèse (22 juin 431)", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 69 (1993) 48-87.

⁸ A. de Halleux, "La première session du concile d'Ephèse (22 juin 431)", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 69 (1993) 73.

⁹ *V* 43, ACO I 1,2,12-13.

¹⁰ *V* 44-45, ACO I 1,2,13-31.

¹¹ *V* 46-47, ACO I 1,2,31-35.

¹² *V* 48-49, ACO I 1,2,35-37.

¹³ *V* 49, ACO I 1,2,36,16-25.

¹⁴ ACO I 1,2,36,8-15. 26-28. A. de Halleux, "Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au concile d'Ephèse (430-433)", *Revue théologique de Louvain* 23 (1992) 447.

¹⁵ On the relationship between the final version of the protocol and the actual debates, see A. de Halleux, "La première session du concile d'Ephèse (22 juin 431)", *Ephemerides Theologicae* 69 (1993) 50-51.

¹⁶ *V* 50; A. de Halleux, "Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au concile d'Ephèse (430-433)", *Revue théologique de Louvain* 23 (1992) 447.

¹⁷ *V* 82,4-6, ACO I 1,3,6-7; A. de Halleux, "Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au concile d'Ephèse (430-433)", *Revue théologique de Louvain* 23 (1992) 446-447.

Nestorius, who had refused to appear as accused at the synod chaired by Cyril, acting as both his persecutor and judge, was deposed on the grounds of the "blasphemies" of his statements, writings, letters and sermons held at Ephesus, and the accusations were based on the canons and the letter of the bishop Celestine¹⁸. The accusers even enlisted the help of Christ himself as a judge¹⁹: "Our Lord Jesus Christ who has suffered injury from him (sc. Nestorius) has decreed through the present very sacred synod ..."

The synod of John of Antioch on 26 June reacted with an incensed decree (ψῆφος) declaring Cyril and Memnon deposed and the other participants at the session of 22 June excommunicated as long as they refused to abjure and condemn the heretic *capitula* of Cyril. Again the "creed of Nicaea" is employed as point of reference, to which nothing should be added. The justifications given by the Eastern bishops for their decree do not explicitly include the deposition of Nestorius; but listed, among others, the fact that the tumults at Ephesus prevented all discussion of the 12 *anathe-* mata²⁰. One may imagine the indignation of the Cyrillians, but even then the protocol of the sessions of 16 and 17 July makes a shocking reading. The Roman legates who had arrived in the meantime, participated [76] in the sessions, which condemned the Easterners as heretics and decreed depositions and excommunications²¹.

Still in July 431 the Cyrillian council settled a few regional questions²²; one may note in particular the motion brought in to the session on 22 July by the presbyter Charisius from Philadelphia²³. Its subject was the *expositio*, ἔκθεσις, which was presented to the Quartodecimans of Philadelphia upon their conversion to the Catholic church²⁴. Charisius demanded the condemnation of the text as heretical. The author- ship of the *expositio* was kept deliberately anonymous in the session's protocol²⁵. The condemnation by the council of the Cyrillians duly followed, its real object was the author of the *expositio*: Theodore of Mopsuestia. The version of the *causa Charisii* as it has come down to us is prefaced by "the confirmation of the symbol of the holy fathers of Nicaea"²⁶. Schwartz has demonstrated that this part of the session is a product of

¹⁸ V 61 end and 62 beginning, ACO I 1,2,54,16-28.

¹⁹ V 62 beginning.

²⁰ In the protocol of the synod of the Eastern bishops (see note 5) V 151,15, ACO I 1,5,122-123.

²¹ V 90, ACO I 1,3,24,21-26,5. Both sessions were conducted, as that on June 22, in the form of a trial.

²² Documents preserved in *Collectio Atheniensis* (= A), ACO I 1,7,73-83, see Schwartz, ACO I 1,4 (sic) *Praefatio*.

²³ E. Schwartz, ACO I 1,4,xvii-xxi; L. Abramowski "Die Sitzung des Konzils von Ephesus am 22. Juli 431 "Über die Befestigung des Symbols der heiligen Väter in Nicäa und über den vom Presbyter Charisius übergebenen Libellus", ZKG 115 (2004) 382-390 [here in this volume pp. 405-413].

²⁴ A 76,4-11, ACO I 1,7,97-100.

²⁵ L. Abramowski "The session of the Council of Ephesus on July 22, 431.

Symbol der heiligen Väter in Nicäa und über den vom Presbyter Charisius übergebenen Libellus", ZKG 115 (2004) 384-385 [here in this volume pp. 406-408].

²⁶ A 73-75, ACO I 1,7,84-95.

later redaction, probably by Cyril himself, and constructed with material from the first session of 22 June²⁷. Starting point for this fictitious session is the first part of the *definitio* on the anonymous ἔκθεσις, which declares that no other confession than that of Nicaea must be upheld²⁸. As is well known, the Ephesian synod did not provide a definition of doctrine; thus it looks like the "confirmation" was born out of Cyril's wish to fill this gap.

Neither of the two synods decreed canons. But here the collectors of such prescriptions helped themselves by extracting single regulations²⁹ [77] from the letter communicating the deposition of the Eastern bishops, addressed to "bishops, presbyters and people of every province or city"³⁰, and counting them as canons I-VI, and the ὁρὸς from the *causa Charisii* as canon VII, also because of the reference (added by the editor)³¹ to Nestorius.

The next step of the emperor was to confirm the depositions of Nestorius, Cyril and Memnon (but not that of the Easterners by the Cyrillians)³². These three were put under custody in Ephesus³³. By order of the emperor delegations of both sides set out for Chalcedon to discuss in his presence, without any results.

In the meantime, Nestorius asked for and was granted permission to return to his home convent near Antioch. Cyril, who had spent considerable amounts of gold and money on bribes³⁴ during the negotiations, managed to escape from Ephesus and reached Alexandria on 31 October 431. Shortly before, on 25 October, Maximilian had been consecrated successor of Nestorius in the presence of the Cyrillian legates. A *sacra* of the emperor³⁵, issued after 31 October stated the inability of the two parties to come to terms, decreed that the Eastern bishops return to their hometowns and churches and declared the dissolution of the synod of Ephesus in view of the fact that³⁶ Cyril had made for Alexandria and Memnon remained at Ephesus; the emperor saw no reason to condemn the Easterners.

²⁷ E. Schwartz, ACO I 1,4,xviii-xix. Material from the first session also at the end of the entire complex, A 78, ACO I 1,7,106-111

²⁸ On the pragmatic character of this assertion, see L. Abramowski "Die Sitzung des Konzils von Ephesus on July 22, 431: "On the attachment of the symbol of the holy fathers in Nicaea and on the Libellus handed over by the presbyter Charisius," ZKG 115 (2004) 389-390 [here in this volume p. 412 f.].

²⁹ I' 91,2-7, ACO I 1,3,27-28.

³⁰ I' 91, ACO I 1,3,26-28.

³¹ E. Schwartz, ACO I 1,4,xviii (sic).

³² I' 93: but only number and title! The content was obviously judged unbearable by the copyist. Text in ACO I 1,3,31-32 from another collection.

³³ A 45, ACO I 1,7,67-68 report of *comes* John on the execution of his task; the *comes* does not conceal his own opinion on the turbulences.

³⁴ *Collectio Casinensis* (= C) 130, ACO I 4,85,25-30.

³⁵ A 97, ACO I 1,7,142.

³⁶ "In view of the fact that" is my own translation of line 27 ἐπὶ τῷ. Latin C 122, ACO I 4,74,1 "ita videlicet". *Ephèse et Chalcedoine. Actes des conciles*, par A. J. Festugière, Paris 1982, 622 follows the

The following year the emperor sent a high official to arrange peace negotiations between the sees of Antioch and Alexandria. John of Antioch [78] was asked to acknowledge the deposition of Nestorius³⁷. The positions of the contestants were irreconcilable: the Eastern bishops "rejected" the "*dogmata* recently introduced per letter or *capitula* "³⁸ with reference to Nicaea and its interpretation in Athanasius' letter to Epictetus, while Cyril demanded the consent of the Easterners to the deposition of Nestorius and the condemnation of "his calumnies and godless *dogmata* "³⁹. John, who knew well that this demand was unacceptable to many of his bishops, presented Cyril through an episcopal messenger with his christological formulation⁴⁰ in the name of his synod. The Alexandrian did not object to it as such, but insisted on his conditions regarding Nestorius. Supplemented by a corresponding addition⁴¹, he accepted the letter of the Antiochene. Cyril's long letter of reply⁴², which adopted the christological confession of the Antiochene synod⁴³ and supplied it with his own interpretations, is the document of the peace treaty of 23 April 433. The confession takes the place of the τύπος which the emperor had called for in his convocation of the council and which was to rest on a common vote.

The nucleus of the symbol of union (ὁμολογοῦμεν - ληφθέντα ναόν)⁴⁴ is contained already in the letter, which the Eastern bishops sent from Ephesus to the emperor in August 431 (where it is followed by the urgent request to remove the *capitula* of Cyril from the church)⁴⁵. In the letter of peace of John we find this nucleus expanded by the Nicene phrase "for our sake and for the sake of our salvation". A further sentence was added, on the "evangelical and apostolic statements on our Lord" which cancels the fourth *anathema* of the letter of the Egyptian synod. This confession was preceded by an introduction on the θεοτόκος παρθένοϛ and stated that the following did not add anything to the Nicene doctrine, but confirmed it. Nestorius would have found no difficulty in signing this symbol of union (urged by John, he had himself employed the θεοτόκος in a sermon in December 430).

standard translation "à la condition que", but his and the Latin translations throw an embarrassing light on the emperor, as if he was giving orders for Cyril to return to Alexandria, a return which at the time was already a *fait accompli*. One may object to my translation that the embarrassment of the *fait accompli* remains and that the four infinitives of the aorist must all be translated analogously (as C and Festugière do), but there are in fact two different points of syntactic dependance for those verbs.

³⁷ V 120,2, ACO I 1,4,3-4.

³⁸ A 105 (John of Antioch to Acacius of Beroia), ACO I 1,7,146.

³⁹ A 107,6 (Cyril to the same Acacius), ACO I 1,7,149.

⁴⁰ V 123,2-3, ACO I 1,4,8-9.

⁴¹ V 123,4, ACO I 1,4,9.

⁴² V 127, ACO I 1,4,15-20.

⁴³ V 127,4-5, ACO I 1,4,17.

⁴⁴ V 123,3, ACO I 1,4,8,27-9,5.

⁴⁵ A 48,6, ACO I 1,7,70. On the *capitula*: A 48,7, ACO I 1,7,30.

[79] Those Eastern bishops who still considered the deposition of Nestorius an injustice were to suffer harsh persecutions by the political authorities. From 436 on, Nestorius was banned several times to more and more remote places of exile; he died in the Egyptian desert in c. 450, not before having learnt of the *Tomus Leonis*, which he greeted wholeheartedly.*

* [The bibliography that follows here in the original has been incorporated into the general bibliography, in this volume pp. 499-508 - *the editor*].

5.9 "Audi, ut dico"

Literary observations and chronological considerations on Marius Victorinus and the "platonizing" Nag Hammadi treatises

Marius Victorinus Afer, a Roman rhetorician whose decision to baptize was held up as an encouraging example to the hesitant Augustine, took part in the contemporary debate on the Trinitarian problem. From 357 to 361, he wrote anti-Arian treatises advocating the Nicene *homoousios*. These writings combine biblical-theological argumentation with a post-Plotinian philosophy of triadic structure and considerable complexity, the closest relative of which is the remainder of a Parmenides commentary preserved in Turin. Certain (Barbelo)gnostic elements in Victorinus' explanations are astonishing, but he does not perceive them as gnostic or heretical. A few years ago, a textual parallel was discovered between Victorinus and the Nag Hammadi treatise "Zostrianus",¹ which put the discussion about mutual relationships on a new footing. The following is a continuation of an earlier contribution on the subject.²

I Marius Victorinus

The philosophical text used jointly by Marius Victorinus and the NH-"Zostrianus" (referred to by the discoverers as "Exposé") on the highest One³ is introduced by both witnesses (who are not dependent on each other) as "revelatory speech". In his commentary on the lines in question, Tardieu explains the invitation in the 2nd pers. sing. as the "key element" of the introduction.⁴ For the invitation "Hear" as the introduction to a divine revelation

¹ Michel Tardieu, *Recherches sur la formation de l'Apocalypse de Zostrien et les sources de Marius Victorinus*. Pierre Hadot, Porphyre et Victorinus. Questions et hypothèses, Bures-sur-Yvette 1996.

² Luise Abramowski, *Niceneism and Gnosticism in the Rome of Bishop Liberius: The Case of Marius Victorinus*, in: ZAC 8, 2005, 513-566 [here in this volume pp. 414-466].

³ Marius Victorinus, *Adversus Arium* I 49,9-50,21. The chapter numbering in the theological works of Marius Victorinus is old; the numbering of the lines is that of the critical edition by Paul Henry and Pierre Hadot in SC 68 (1960) and CSEL 83 (1971), the line lengths of the two editions are identical. - "Zostrianus" is Nag [146] Hammadi Codex VIII 1, the page numbers are those of the Codex, NH VIII 1; 64,49-66,13 is to be compared with Mar. Vict., Adv. Ar. I 49,7-40; for I 50,1-18 there are only scattered testimonies over the pages NH VIII 1; 66. 67. 74. 75, whereas Adv. Ar. I 50,18-21 is more literal NH VIII 1; 75:12-24 and 84:18-21.

⁴ Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note 1), 61; only briefly mentioned in Abramowski, *Nicēnismus und Gnosis* (see note 2), 532 [here in this volume p. 432].

he first gives examples from Jamblichus and from the Corpus Hermeticum and then continues: "Cet artifice est essentiel et a pour but d'assimiler l'exposé métaphysique à un *logos* sacré, reçu au terme d'une montée ou descente". In Victorinus, the formula appears in other places (the plural from *Adversus Arium* I, as it turns out): "En I 53,30-31, cette formule introduit un exposé sur les noms trinitaires et l'Esprit comme mère⁵ du Logos. En I 60,1 elle introduit un exposé sur l'âme double et le Logos androgyne, à la fois intellect et sagesse. En I 62,25 enfin, elle introduit une exégèse de Genèse 2,7 à la lumière de la théorie des deux âmes et des deux intellects". There is also IV 4,1, where the *reader* is addressed as a listener: *audi lector*, "pour introduire un développement sur le vivre qui est le Père et la vie qui est le Fils".

It is worth taking a closer look at the sections introduced in this way.

Adv. Ar. I 53,30-31. This is immediately preceded by lines 26-30:6 We must therefore believe in God's Son, who brings about life in us, because he himself is true, eternal life. "For if we will have faith in the Christ from Nazareth (Nazareus), incarnate from Mary, we will have faith in the Son of God, *who was (Spirit) and became Spirit incarnate. Quomodo istud? Audi, ut dico*". 54,1, where the promised communication is expected, continues, however, that it must *first be* seen whether a certain series of attributes is to be ascribed to the Son or to the Father. Hadot in his commentary on 53:26-317 draws attention to the fact that the answer to the question "Quomodo istud?" does not appear until 56:36. - This answer covers 56:36-57:6, concerns, like the initial question, the incarnation and basically applies to the problem that repeatedly arises exegetically and dogmatically of how the Logos and the Spirit relate to each other in the incarnation, i.e. how John 1:14 and Luke 1:35 are to be reconciled. [147] Marius Victorinus sets an equal sign: *universalis λόγος et potentia vitae caro factus est*, ut dicit Angelus: *spiritus sanctus adveniet in te et virtus altissimi inumbrabit tibi [...] Omnia igitur Christus dominus noster, caro, sanctus spiritus, altissimi virtus, λόγος* - not just one of them. Like the one for the initial question at the end of c. 53, the answer is quite brief, but is in one of the endless difficult speculations that Victorinus loves; Tardieu has related the announcement 53.30 f. to the speculation as a whole, which is not correct.

⁵ The term "mother" only I 58,12!

⁶ I 53,9-23 contains, prompted by the "forma" of line 8 f., *Propter hoc enim dictum est, quoniam filius forma est patris* (cf. Phil. 2,6), a short exposition on concealment and revelation, occultum/velatum and manifestum/apparentia, reminiscent of the barbelognostic greats Kalyptos and Protophanes. Cf. Luise Abramowski, Marius Victorinus, Porphyrius und die römischen Gnostiker, in: ZNW 74, 1983, 108-128. The essay is reprinted as no. XIII in my anthology "Formula und Context", Aldershot 1992. The discovery of the literary relationships between Marius Victorinus and a NH text has led me to a new definition of the relationship between Gnostic and philosophical elements in the Roman rhetorician, cf. Abramowski, Nicä-nismus und Gnosis (see note 2).

⁷ SC 69, 863.

Also much clearer than it appears according to Tardieu is the next *casus*, *Adv. Ar. I 60,1*. The content given by Tardieu (see above) applies to the general context, but does not determine the exact scope of the "revelation". The preceding c. 59 argues, among other things, against those who describe *usia* as an unbiblical vocabulary; thus the author brings biblical passages in which *substantia* occurs.⁸ 60,1 f., however, refers back to 59,13-17 with *voũs*, *sapientia* and *λόγος* and wants to communicate the meaning of these words: *Quid vero significant, audi ut dico*. This is followed by a description of the *circularis motus* of the *summus voũs* and the *sapientia perfecta*, "*hoc est λόγος universalis*", which escalates to a description of the *Logos* as a *sphaera* (sphere). In his classification of the passage in the larger context, Hadot speaks of a "*developpement sur la sphère du Logos (60,1-31) qui s'explique parceque Victorinus semble utiliser une source [...]*".⁹ The end of what is solemnly communicated is indicated (and thus probably the end of the source piece, a quotation!): 60.27 *hic est deus*. Together with the exhortation of 60:1, this results in an *inclusio*; Victorinus gives this piece a Christian prayer ending, 60:27-31: *hic est deus, λόγος totus, voũs totus, tota sapientia, omnipo- tens substantiva substantia, quem veremur, quem colimus, solo spiritu videntes, ipsius nutu et voluntate in ipsum erecti, gratia crucis miserante nos domino nostro Jesu Christo*. Ἀμήν. Victorinus thus emphasizes the character of the "revelation". The "Hic est deus" is the justification for adopting this piece of "mathematical" metaphysics into the doctrine of God and the Trinity. In Victorinus' source, the complex of ideas of point, circle, sphere as movement served to illustrate the inclusion of *esse*, *vivere*, *intellegere* (60:15 f.), so 60:12-27. It is Victorinus who applies this in turn to the relationship of Father and Son (60:7), but it is hard to say how much of the text around this line comes from his own pen.

For the next passage given by Tardieu, *Adv. ar. I 62,25* one must begin earlier than Tardieu, namely at 62,6. There begins a small doxography concerning the structure of man. 62,6-11: *quidem putant ... quidem rursus ... adhuc quidem ...* These latter think that man [148] consists *de corpore quadripotenti quattuor elementorum et anima duplici et duplici τῷ νῷ* (62,9-11). Marius Victorinus agrees with this view: *Mea intelligentia haec*, 62,11. Then follow a few lines about the body with key words from Gen 2,7 (62,11-14): *Corpus enim sic [...] habemus principia corporis*. 62:14 marks the beginning of the presentation of the double *voũs* and the double *anima*, "declared" by the *evangelium cata Matthaeum et cata Lucam*. Mt 24:39-41 is quoted first, but as the following shows, only the Matthaean

⁸ From Victorinus' comment I 59,25 f. on Lk 15,12 f. (line 24 f.: the Son demands his share of the "substantia" from the Father; the Son wastes the "substantia" "there") it is clear that Victorinus understands this as a statement about the soul: when the Son "descended from there, he held his *potentiae*

not fixed" - "that refers" to the soul (*Ista animae sunt*) It is assumed to be a figurative interpretation - is it also one of the Valentinian traces found in Victorinus?

⁹ SC 69, 877 below.

text is interpreted as νοῦς and anima. Victorinus then continues: Lucas autem adiecit de corpore duo, for which Lk 17,34 f. (the "two in one bed") is cited. In the explanation (62:21-25) it says: the "two in the field" (in Mt) are two λόγοι or νόες, one heavenly, the other heavenly, the "two grinding in the mill" are two souls, one heavenly, the other heavenly. "Thus" the heavenly νοῦς or λόγος and the heavenly soul, the hylisch, λόγος and soul, are "left behind". Hadot¹⁰ has found analogies in Origen's commentary on Matthew and Ambrose's commentary on Luke, both with the distribution between two νόες and two souls; Origen, however, "unites"

"not all these elements in the same individual", unlike Ambrose.¹¹ No one of these two commentators uses the adjective hylisch. Tardieu¹² cites two lines (62,26 f.) from the continuation of the passage discussed so far precisely because of this adjective among the "Gnostic themes" in Victorinus. But the predicate "gnostic" would then also have to apply to the preceding text just referred to because of "hylisch".¹³ The *continuation*, which extends to the end of the chapter, begins with: Quomodo istud, *audi*. Hadot¹⁴ gives as the content of 62:25-39: "Exégèse du récit de la Genèse à la lumière de la théorie des deux intelligences et des deux âmes". In the narrower context, however, the "revelatory" explanation presents itself as a *justification* for the existence of two νόες and two souls, which characterizes the preceding New Testament exegesis. The end of the "speech of revelation" is clearly indicated, as in the case of the spherical movement of the Logos, using the same means of a soteriological turn: the man just described "must be purified [...] ut accipiat lumen aeternum et aeternam vitam; hoc autem perficit fides in Christo", 62,37-39. The constitution of the human being in the "revelatory" part of chapter 62 is more complicated than in lines 11-25: this is not only due to the consideration of the "sensus" (for which the Greek αἰσθησις would have to be assumed), but also to the "localization" of the elements of the human constitution "into one another". The "audi" of 62:25 is therefore a literary seam that marks the beginning of the use of another source.

[149] If one compares the introductory formulas Adv. Ar. I 49,7; 53,30; 60,1 and 62,25, we find that, apart from 60,1, they are preceded by the question "Quomodo istu(c)d?"; before 60,1 it says: "Quid vero ista significant [...]". This means that the following

"Revelations" are understood as explanations.

¹⁰ Commentary on 62:14-25, SC 69, 887 f.

¹¹ Ibid, 888.

¹² Tardieu/Hadot, Recherches sur la formation (see note I), 11a, point 7.

¹³ In the commentary on 62,27 (SC 69, 888), Hadot brings a Gnostic passage from the Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria: ψυχὴν γεώδη καὶ ὑλικήν.

¹⁴ Commentary on 62:25-39, SC 69, 888.

Outside of Adv. Ar. I, a comparable exhortation is found twice more, Adv. Ar. IV 4,1 and Ad Candidum 7,1, Adv. Ar. IV 4,1. Tardieu¹⁵ has already pointed out that the *reader* should listen here: Audi, lector, audi quod miraberis, lector. And this is what the listening reader is supposed to admire (4,1-3): "What is so difficult, so intricate, so *closed*, we will unfold here in a treatise (tractatu) on God and the divine through a simple discussion (simplici disputatione)". It is not the "closed" (clausa), the mysterious, that is the object of "revelation" here, but the "simple" discussion with its element of rationality! This remark by Victorinus does not seem to me to be without irony,¹⁶ at least he is aware of the peculiarity of his style. Just look at the previous section (3,23-38), where he talks about vivere and vita, of which he himself says (3,34 f.): Scio hoc obscurum videri posse, non tam rerum quam eorundem repetitionem sermonum. The subject of the "simple discussion" is then, of course, Victorinus' Christian doctrine of God as substantia and spirit; it fills the whole of c. 4. Hadot takes the section up to 5,4, but these lines begin: Ac de deo probatum puto [...], namely by the preceding text. The thematic and thus also literary coherence of 4,3-4,32 results from the beginning and end: Deum certe fatemur omnes, deum omnipotentem [...] Tria enim ista spiritus sunt: deus, Jesus, Spiritus sanctus. Hadot¹⁷ summarizes the course of argumentation in five points: "1. we believe in God (4:1-5). 2 We therefore realize that he is (4:5 f.). 3 But how are we to define his being (4:6)? 4 We define it as a substantia, which is the Spirit (4:7-16). 5. this spirit lives and is life (4:17-32).¹⁸ As I said, I regard Hadot's 6th point, "Conclusion (5:1-4)", as a confirmation of Victorinus' view that what is to be admired by the reader is complete. Hadot describes this "sequence of ideas here in Victorinus as completely stereotypical". The constancy of the scheme can be seen in Adv. Ar. I 30,18-31,17; I 55,3-12; III 6,23-35. But in the text of the passages cited, the schema does not appear with the same stringency as here; its elements are scattered in more detailed explanations.

At a later point in his study, Tardieu¹⁹ *Ad Cand.* 7,2-7 because of its content and adds: "Ce passage introduit comme pour l'exposé commun au *Zostrien* et par la formule *audi quemadmodum dico* est peut-être aussi une citation provenant du même exposé". Unlike in Adv. Ar., the question [150] "How so?" is missing. Ad Candidum precedes the treatises Adv. Ar. I-IV - but the formula of revelation can already be found here and in all other treatises.

¹⁵ Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note I), 61a.

¹⁶ Cf. also Hadot, SC 69, commentary, 985 on 4:1-3: "Cette apostrophe rendra courage, même au lecteur moderne"!

¹⁷ Ibid, 985 on 4:1-5:4.

¹⁸ This provides the connection to c. 3.

¹⁹ Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note I), 85b; Abramowski, *Nicänismus und Gnosis* (as note 2), 535 [here in this volume p. 435].

places may well be inspired by the citation of the exposé introduced in this way. Ad Cand. 7,2-7 is interesting for Victorinus due to the "chaîne ascendente" of the truly existent in the usual terms with the intensification formulas *supercaelestia* [...] et adhuc *superius* [...] et *super ista omnia*.²⁰ The end of the "Revelation" is given, as in other cases, by the new mental insertion (line 7 *In ista noster voûs* [...]), designated in Hadot's translation by a new paragraph. However, the identical introductory formula necessarily means the derivation of the section from the source of the exposé.

If one surveys the passages emphasized with "Hear" (with or without the preceding question), including the exposé in Adv. Ar. I 49. 50, then one might be inclined to see in this imperative the introduction of significant quotations; but the fact that Victorinus in this way in two cases makes special reference to statements of his Christian theology (in whose service his whole enterprise stands after all) prevents one from making this explanation. The call to Under his pen, "listening" has become a general reference to the authority of what is shared; in the case of "quotations", this probably also underlines the legitimacy of quoting.

The Coptic parallel has shown that in Adv. Ar. I 49 "Audi" belongs to the source (even if only the first letter of the imperative is preserved in Coptic). The repetition of "quomodo istud" in the texts discussed above could also have its cause in the fact that the question belongs to the source of I 49. 50; in Coptic it could be found again in the trailing colon, compare with each other *Quomodo istud? audi ut dico //* "Zostrien, écoute à propos *que tu cherches*"²¹.

On this occasion, we notice the means by which the quotation is incorporated into the *Gnostic* context: by addressing the recipient of the revelation. The revelation is announced as such in "Zostrianus", 64,8-11: "Salamex [and] those [who] have revealed [to me] saying, Zostrianus [...]"²² The passage in "Zostrianus", which corresponds to Victorinus c. 49,7-40, goes beyond its comparative text at the end, "[...] prae omnibus quae vere sunt" (thus in Tardieu's reading, which follows Sichard's edition),²³ with "qui procèdent de l'Esprit véritablement existant".²⁴ I.e. "Zostrianus" begins his *paraphrase* of the second part of the exposé (Paraphrase and

²⁰ Cf. the scheme in Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note I), 85b.

²¹ See the synopsis Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note I), 34b.

²² Translation John H. Sieber, Nag Hammadi Library in English, Leiden 31988, 419. the German translation of the NH find: Nag Hammadi Deutsch I. II, by Hans Martin Schenke/ Hans-G. Bethge/Ursula U. Kaiser (GCS NF 8.12), Berlin-New York 2001. 2003. With the help of the page numbers of the codices, quotations can then be found. Unfortunately, the line numbers are not included. The translation of the triadic names Kalyptos, Protophanes, Autogenes into German is regrettable.

²³ Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note I), 37a below.

²⁴ Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note I), 38b above.

no longer closed rendition) already here. Incidentally, he had already derived "omnia quae vere sunt" from the "spirit" in the first part,²⁵ i.e. [151] here too he made a transfer from the second part of the exposé to the first.

The function of the exposé in its respective context is much less easy to determine in "Zostrianus" than in Victorinus because of the great loss of text. At the beginning of Adv. Ar. I 49, he says that he has sufficiently spoken of God and Logos, i.e. of Father and Son, as well as of the Logos, i.e. of the Son and the Holy Spirit and their unity. Victorinus then formulates the problem of One and Two and their identity in abstract terms. This is followed by the question "How so?". The exposé itself mentions the *Father* (50:1);²⁶ and the central role of the *Spirit* for the unity of the One is clear enough in the second part.

For Victorinus (as for "Zostrianus"), the entire exposé is a single continuous text, which, as we now know, he took from a source. The end of the exposé can be determined by the new approach in 50.22, which speaks of the "emergence" of the One; in this status it is referred to as "unum-unum".

In fact, however, the exposé consists of two parts, not only in terms of content but also *in literary terms*. What is now the opening formula of c. 50, *Hic est deus, hic pater, is actually the closing formula of the first part*. Compare the revelatory speech Adv. Ar. I 60,1-27 on the Logos as a sphere (discussed above), it begins "Audi ut dico" and ends "*hic est deus*".

We have an analogous closing formula, in this case "Haec deus", in Adv. Ar. IV 24,39, certainly not by chance at the end of a quotation that is exceptionally described as such: "unde dictus est [...]" (line 34 f.), but the usual "Hear." The quotation has not been identified to this day.²⁷ I am adding the pretty text (with counting of the lines) here.

34 unde dictus 35 est
et:²⁸

sedere quasi in centro τῶν πάντων ὄντων id est omnium 36 quae sunt, unde universali oculo, id est lumine substantiae 37 suae, qua vel esse est vel vivere vel intelligere, lineas τῶν 38 ὄντων non versabili ("immutabile") aspectu videt, quia et quies est et a 39 centro simul in omnia unus est visus. Haec deus.

For the whole and the details I refer to Hadot's comment;²⁹ here only hints at the organization of the text. "Unde" in line 34 refers to the preceding section 24:21-34, in which a long series of predicates of the unum

²⁵ Tardieu/Hadot, Recherches sur la formation (see note I), 34b below.

²⁶ After that, "pater" no longer appears in the Latin version of the second part; but in the Testimonies from "Zostrianus" to I 50, the "father" appears followed by the "mother"! See Tardieu/Hadot, Recherches sur la formation (see note I), 40b, Testimonium b.

²⁷ SC 68, Apparat: auctor incertus; in Tardieu/Hadot, Recherches sur la formation (see note I), 123b it is listed among the unidentified citations.

²⁸ I have added the colon for clarification.

²⁹ SC 69, 1035 f.

is enumerated³⁰ and its relationship to omnia is determined, "ut ne duo, auditor³¹, accipias"; the section with a pun on "quies" ("quies" also in the following quotation). The following can be said of this one "also" (line 35 "et"). The [152] details of the quotation "can be found in various directions of Greek thought."³² The "sitting" is reminiscent of the countless images of the enthroned Zeus; Hadot contributes a passage from Synesius ("from another context"): "God sits unshakable", - "idée de la stabilité". The quotation is interspersed with explanations by Victorinus; the first is the translation of the Greek words, line 35 f. The colon in line 37, qua vel esse est vel vivere vel intellegere, is most certainly an insertion by Victorinus. The "qua" refers to "substantia" in the preceding colon: "id est lumine substantiae suae" (36 f.). If this were also an explanation of Victorinus, then the indirect quotation would be reduced to:

... sedere quasi in centro τῶν πάντων ὄντων unde universali oculo lineas non versabili aspectu videt, quia et quies est et a centro simul in omnia unus est visus ("un seul regard se dirige en temps vers toutes choses"). - So much for "hic/haec deus" as a closing formula.

That, as in the transition from Adv. Ar. I 49 to 50, the concluding identification formula can become the *beginning* of a subsequent exposition, we have the unfortunately incomplete example of the Amelius quotation in Euseb:³³ καὶ οὗτος ἄρα ἦν ὁ λόγος καθ' ὃν [...] Dörrie has rightly inferred from this beginning of the quotation that an investigation into the nature of the Logos must have preceded it.³⁴ My assumption is that its conclusion could have been οὗτος (or ταῦτα) ὁ λόγος. Amelius' *confirmation* of the idea by referring to Heraclitus and using a foreign source (John's prologue) is elegantly prepared by the ἄρα. The exposé in Marius Victorinus, on the other hand, simply reverses the direction of the identifying final formula: it no longer points backwards, but forwards. There is a reference back in the following apposition of predicates of God, which are reminiscent of the conclusion of 49; however, there is no transitional "now" or substantiating "namely".

The second part of the exposé also follows on stylistically from the first: it makes use of word formations with "prae-", derivative abstracts ending in "-itas"; thematic references: (of course) unity of the divine in itself; but above all in the theme of movement (motio, certain = κίνησις). This is offset by the

³⁰ On this list, cf. Abramowski, Nicänismus und Gnosis (see note 2), 539 f. [here in this volume p. 439 f.].

³¹ In another place the "lector" is supposed to "hear"; here the reader is addressed as "auditor".

³² SC 69, 1036 supra.

³³ Euseb, Praeparatio evangelica XI 19,1.

³⁴ Abramowski, Nicänismus und Gnosis (as note 2), 515 [here in this volume p. 414 f.] on Heinrich Dörrie, Une exégèse néoplatonicienne du prologue de l'évangile de saint Jean, in: Jacques Fontaine/Charles Kannengiesser (eds.), Epektasis (FS Jean Daniélou), Paris 1972, 75-87, here 78.

Differences between the two parts: the role of the spirit (*spiritus*) in the second part - on the one hand it is fundamental (*unalitas spiritūs*, 50,5), on the other hand it is discussed (by Victorinus?); the trinity (50,5. 10); the barbelognostic triad *existentia*, *vita*, *beatitudo* (50,11. 13 f. 15); *intellegentialitas* (50,19) next to *beatitudo* reminds us that *beatitudo* stood in for original *intellectus*; finally *potentia*, which is *idea* et λόγος *sui ipsius*, - the expression by which Hadot discovered the literary relationship "Zostrianus"- Victorinus [153]; what does it mean that the paraphrase of the second part of the exposé in "Zostrianus" uses precisely this formulation several times?³⁵

The second part of the exposé sees itself as a continuation and supplement to the first part, hence the new direction of the original concluding formula of the first part. The literary seam between the two parts suggests a different author for the second part than that of the first part, an author who is not only interested in the role of the spirit in the supreme deity, but also labels it with the predicate "three-powerful". If we distinguish between two authors for the two parts of the exposé, then the assessment of the first part can be made independently of that of the second. There is no doubt that the first part is not gnostic. But one is now also freer in one's judgment of the second part; one no longer needs to establish exegetically the compatibility of the content with the first part, although this is taken for granted by the author of the second part. With this view of mine about the author of the second part of the synopsis, a step has thus been taken beyond my correction of Hadot's translation in line 50.5: the author is a (Barbelo)Gnostic.³⁶ If *the second part of the exposé*, deliberately complementing the first part, *exhibits the characteristics of the platonizing Barbelo-Gnosis*³⁷ and the whole exposé is treated by Victorinus as a literary unit, *then the source of the exposé in Victorinus (and in "Zostrianus"!)* is also *Barbelognostic*. The barbelognostic

³⁵ Abramowski, *Nicänismus und Gnosis* (as note 2), 543 [here in this volume p. 442 f.].

³⁶ This would also bring my considerations in *Nicänismus*, 536 [here in this volume p. 436], about whether this second part (according to the correction I made to Hadot's translation of *spiritus*) is Middle Platonic possible or not.

³⁷ This assessment also finally clarifies the origin of "*spiritus*" in this text, which I have discussed in my older essay "*Marius Victorinus, Porphyrius [...]*" (see note 6 above), which attributed the "three-fold" to the influence of the Gnostics on Porphyrius; in doing so, I followed Hadot's authoritative suggestions, who counted the passage as Porphyrian material in Victorinus. This led me, and subsequently Ruth Majercik, to a dating of "Zostrianus" and "Allogenes" to the time after 268, because the philosophical influence on the NH writings could not be traced back to Plotinus. Tardieu, who discusses this in Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note 1), 13b- 15a, mocks our derivations for the so problematic *spiritus* in Adv. Ar. I 50, *ibid.* I 50. But my old thesis of the Gnostic origin of "*tripotens*" and "*spiritus*" in Victorinus' text proves to be correct. But after the discovery of the exposé through its double attestation, the complicated detour that I previously assumed is no longer necessary: Victorinus has the exposé, which is only half Gnostic in itself, from a Gnostic source.

"Zostrianus" thus uses a barbelognostic source, namely a source that already belongs to the platonizing type of this gnosis. Did the author of the Does "Zostrianus" in its current form therefore justify the entries from the second to the first part of the exposé already observed above? The formula that designates the literary seam between the two parts is dropped in his case.³⁸ Tardieu rightly asks himself why the Latin and the Coptic [154] diverge from here on.³⁹ Could it not be that the content of the second part of the exposé was already familiar to the author of "Zostrianus" from other texts and that he therefore allowed himself to deal with it with the greatest freedom? The result of this handling is the following:⁴⁰ "Outre leur lacunes, les dix-huit pages du *Zostrien* à examiner (66,12-84,22) sont passablement embrouillées du point de vue de leur contenu. Elles utilisent une abondante terminologie philosophique, celle-là même employée par Marius Victorinus, mais sont entremêlées de traits et de réflexions proprement gnostiques qui aboutiront aux doxologies de Barbélo dans les pages 86-87 et suivantes". That is to say, I add, that the philosophical material is placed at the service of the Gnostic (and not the other way around).

Tardieu is one of those gnosis and NH specialists who are of the opinion that the entire NH "Zostrianus" (in its Greek form, of course) was available to the Plotinus school.⁴¹ Would Tardieu draw the same philosophical-historical conclusions from his dating of "Zostrianus" as John D. Turner, for example, has long advocated?

II Barbelognostic

The introductory formula "Audi ut dico", with which Marius Victorinus introduces the exposé in Adv. Ar. I 49. 50 and which he also uses elsewhere (in imitation of that quotation?),

³⁸ See the synopsis in Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note 1), 38.

³⁹ Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note 1), 88b.

⁴⁰ Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note 1), 88bf.

⁴¹ Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note 1), 89a; 90b; explicitly 112. last passage: "De mon point de vue, *la totalité*" (my emphasis) "du Zostrien dont nous connaissons la contenue par la version copte des Nag Hammadi codices *était déjà écrite en 263*" (my emphasis), "lors de l'arrivée des Gnostiques dans l'école de Plotin". (This is directed against me and Majercik). "La réflexion du Plotin, trouvant ridicule d'introduire dans les réalités premières la division de l'acte et de la puissance (II 9 [33], 1,23-26), vise le Zostrien 78,10-16 (publié dans PVP II,540) et 79,9-14, passages qui appartiennent à la section du traité où est paraphrasée la theologie positive de l'exposé cité par Marius Victorinus)". - In fact, this complex is to be added to those parts of "Zostrianus" that Antoinette Clark Wire has compiled (see below), because they are found both in Plotinus and on the Gnostic side and can therefore be attributed to the form of the text as it was already available to Plotinus.

it has in common with the parallel in "Zostrianus". The same formula seems to have been just as popular with the Barbelognostics.

1) In the Apocryphon of John it serves to insert a section,⁴² which belongs to the platonizing treatment of this barbelognostic text. The Revelator, who announces teachings of various contents at John's request, asks John: "Hear [...] what I say to you" [155] (BG43 8502,2; 22,11 f.).⁴⁴ And the "quomodo istuc" in Marius Victorinus, where it precedes the "audi, ut dico", corresponds in the Apocryphon to "and me, who wished to understand ..." (22,16 f.). In Victorinus we have observed that the texts introduced with the "listen" request can be clearly distinguished. This is also the case in the Apocalypse of John, where the end can be recognized by the use of a new explanation that begins with the rhetorical question: "What shall I say to you concerning him?". The self-interruption in the version of the Apocryphon NH II 1; 4,10 is in this short form, which is to be taken as the original, whereas BG has extended the self-interruption, 26,1-6.⁴⁵ The scope of the clearly delimited and literarily carefully integrated piece makes up almost exactly one page (106) in the visually easy-to-read print of NH Libr^{Engl3}: "And I asked to know it [...] (107) How am I to speak with you about him?"

On the other hand, it is known that there are close connections in terms of content between part of the Apocryphon and Irenaeus's speech in Adv. Haer. I 29 exist. Thus we have a pre-Plotinian terminus ad quem for this part of the Apocryphon, namely the time of composition of *Adversus haereses*, i.e. the year 185 approximately. Tardieu has divided his translation of the Apocryphon into paragraphs, which makes it easy to visualize the proportions of the text. According to his organization, the parallels to Irenaeus in the Apocryphon begin with § 13 (BG, 27,8; NH II 1; 4,29);⁴⁶ Tardieu's Index locorum to "Irenaeus" gives the following paragraphs to Adv. haer. I 29,1-5 gives the following paragraphs of the Coptic: 13-16. 19-24. 26. 28 f. 40,⁴⁷ this out of 79 paragraphs of the entire text. The philosophizing interpolation at the beginning already has the inviting "Listen" in § 5, its corpus fills § 6-9 (§ 10 is the self-subjugation).

⁴² Described by John D. Turner in his (as yet unpublished) lecture of 2005, "The Platonizing Sethian treatises, Marius Victorinus' philosophical sources, and pre-plotinian Parmenides commentaries", 1 note 1, as "Introductory theogony" [the lecture is published under the title 'Victorinus, Parmenides Commentaries and the Platonizing Sethian Treatises', in: *Platonisms: Ancient, Modern, and Postmodern*, ed. by K. Corrigan and J. Turner, Leiden 2007, 53-96, published - ed.]

⁴³ BG = (Codex) Berolinensis gnosticus.

⁴⁴ Michel Tardieu, *Codex de Berlin (Sources gnostiques et manichéennes 1)*, Paris 1984, 86a. - I follow the Berlin Codex because it preserves the Apoc. of John incomparably better than one of the NH versions. The differences between the versions are of course taken into account.

⁴⁵ Tardieu, *Codex* (see note 44), 90 both versions side by side.

⁴⁶ Tardieu, *Codex* (see note 44), 92 f.

⁴⁷ Tardieu, *Codex* (as note 44), 440; but in the apparatus of passages for the translation of § 40 no Irenaeus text given.

breaking of the revelatory speaker). Irenaeus obviously did not find this metaphysical beginning. The barbelo (also in Irenaeus) only appears in § 13 (BG, 27,8-28,4; NH II 1; 4,29-5,11); but paragraphs 11 and 12 represent a transition which presumably incorporated the original one, cf. the "Aeon" § 11 and Irenaeus I 29,1. The headings that Tardieu gives to the paragraphs of the preceding text sound quite familiar to the reader of Tardieu/Hadot: § 6 Le Père est Ésprit,⁴⁸ § 7 Éminence et Antériorité, § 8 Synthèse des Opposés, § 9 Attributs positifs.

[156] In purely quantitative terms, then, the Apocryphon of John has undergone a considerable development: on the one hand, an enormous increase in the mythological Gnostic material from § 30 onwards, and on the other, the addition of the metaphysical revelation discourse. No one will want to attribute these two processes to the same hand; presumably they did not occur at the same time - but when? I consider the addition of Gnostic material to be older than the insertion of the metaphysical discourse. The terminus a quo for both is around 185. We are of course interested here in a possible dating of this philosophical piece.

2) In Marsanes, NH X,1, I cannot recognize any literary interpolation; of course, the text is miserably preserved. As a *whole*, of course, it is a revelatory discourse; it is regarded as Sethian without any clear evidence for this. What it has in common with the clearly barbelognostic, Platonizing NH treatises is that it is Platonically influenced. I cite it here only as an example of the freedom in the dating question that the non-mention in the Vita Plotini provides. See Birger A. Pearson in his introduction to "Marsanes" in NH Libr ^{Engl3}:49 "Marsanes is one of the Sethian tractates in the Nag Hammadi corpus that have been profoundly influenced by Platonist philosophy. The others are *The Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5), *Zostrianos* (VIII,1), and *Allogenes* (XI,3). In fact, both in terms of its metaphysics and its ritual references, *Marsanes* represents a kind of Platonism which coheres well with that of the Syrian Neoplatonist philosopher, Jamblichus of Chalcis (ca. 250-325 C. E.). For *Marsanes*, as for Jamblichus, matter is not evil; indeed it is capable for salvation (see esp. 5,14-26). Here we see a definite attenuation of the radical dualism characteristic of earlier Gnostic texts. For *Marsanes*, as for Jamblichus, the descent of the soul into matter is not regarded as a fall but as a demiurgic function, a doctrine based on Plato's discussion of the soul and its descent in the

⁴⁸ Unlike in the second part of the exposé, the identification is actually stated here. - It is interesting to compare the translations by Tardieu in Codex (see note 44), by Frederik Wisse in NH Libr ^{Engl3} (see note 22) and by Michael Waldstein in: Schenke, NH Deutsch I (see note 22) alongside Waldstein draws the identification sentence to the preceding one and then begins a new section, in [156] contrast to his predecessors. The opening sentence, "The monad is a monarchy", in Tardieu § 6, only comes about through the mutual supplementation of the incomplete texts. As with the barbelognostic triad, I complain that "monad" and "monarchy" are not preserved as termini in the German translation, as they are in the Coptic, but appear as "unity" and "singular origin".

⁴⁹ NH Libr ^{Engl3} (see note 22), 460-462, here 461.

Timaëus (41a-42b). In *Marsanes*, the descent of a figure called 'the Self-begotten One' symbolically represents the descending soul in its demiurgic function (5,27-6,16). Similar ideas are expressed in Jamblichus' famous treatise, *On the Mysteries of Egypt* (De mysteriis VIII,3)".

3) Allogenes NH XI,3, is described by Antoinette Clark Wire in the introduction to NH Libr^{Engl3} as follows:⁵⁰ As a whole, the treatise is "a single revelatory speech"; two parts are to be distinguished, I 45,1-57,23; II 57,24-69,19. In the first part there are again five revelations of the female deity Youel to the Allogenes. - So far Clark Wire.

The surviving text begins immediately with the "three-powerful", then Kalyptos, Protophanes and Autogenes appear. 47,7 introduces a revelatory speech in the form we are familiar with. "[But] concerning the invisible, [157] spiritual Triple- Powered one, *hear!*". This is followed by a text in the philosophical form we are also familiar with, *without* all the barbelognostic figures, including the "three-powerful one". This proclamation ends with a list of derivative abstracts: "vitality, mentality, that which is" and their mutual inclusivity. "And the three are one, although individually they are three" (49:26-37). The fact that this revelatory speech ends here is clear from the next sentence: "*Now after I heard these things ...*"

In the second part, written after the recipient of the revelation, i.e. Allogenes, had meditated for a hundred years (!), I noticed the frequently recurring expression "primary revelation". In the Greek Patristic Lexicon this is the translation of πρωτοφάνεια⁵¹ (in Liddell/Scott the lemma does not exist). While "protophanes" is transliterated in the Allogenes, this is not the case with the *protophaneia* to be developed.⁵² And what exactly is the vocabulary supposed to mean? Original revelation, original revelation? The first and second parts of the Allogenes can be divided between two different authors: the hundred-year pause for reflection is a very clever justification for the addition of a further exposition and fits perfectly into the general staging of supernatural and therefore mysterious revelations. In both parts of the treatise, the philosophical elements serve to interpret the barbelognostic beyond; the barbelognostic elements are retained so that the philosophical components are in turn mythologized. The spiritualizing interpretation can also be made in the following way. At the beginning of the second part of the Allogenes, barbelognostic variables are "seen" by Allogenes, 58,12 "I saw [...]". I quote this small passage here,

⁵⁰ Ibid, 490.

⁵¹ As evidence, a passage from the "Heavenly Hierarchy" (10,1) of Ps. Areopagita given.

⁵² With Allogenes 62,27-63,25 (in the second part of Scripture) the content is compared with Joh. Apokr. BG, 24,9-25,7, cf. Clark Wire, NH Stud 28, 177. A synopsis in Turner's lecture (see note 42 above). - Nag Hammadi Studies 28 (1990), ed. Charles W. Hedrick, contains (within the "Coptic Gnostic Library") the bilingual edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices XI, XII, XIII.

because it shows itself to be philosophically interwoven in the adjectives and predicates assigned to the familiar figures, see my emphasis. Turner⁵³ NH Libr^{Engl3} translation of 58,12-27: "I saw the good divine Autogenes; and the Saviour is the youthful, perfect Triple-Male Child; and his goodness, the *noetic* perfect Protophanes-Harmedon; and the *blessedness* of the Kalyptos and the primary origin of the *blessedness*, the Aeon of Barbelo full of divinity; and the primary origin of the one without origin, the spiritual, invisible Triple-Powered One, the universal One that is *higher than perfect*".

The next vision ("I saw [...]" 58,35 f.) takes place in the state of a *rapture* from the body ("<I> was taken [...] out of the garment that was upon me, and taken up to a holy place [...]" 58,28-31). Allogenes is now also addressed in a way that enlightens him about his relationship to the divine realm [158] and his behavior in it. His stay there is also self-knowledge (59,13-15 "[...] by which you know your proper self and, seeking yourself, [...]"). After the salutation, Allogenes describes his behavior in the afterlife (60:13-22), which is based entirely on what he has just heard, i.e. represents a doubling. The divine realm is characterized by bliss, liveliness, existence (ὑπαρξις) and by the unknown One. In addition, there is the pair of terms στάσις - κίνησις. The "movement" is assigned to "liveliness": "[...] withdraw to the Vitality that you will see *moving*" (59,14-15); in withdrawing into "liveliness" Allogenes "saw" "an eternal, intellectual, undivided *motion* that pertains to all the formless powers [...]" (60,25-27). But the author's greater interest lies in "standing" (and "rest"): "[...] but if you wish to *stand*, withdraw to the ὑπαρξις and you will find it *standing* and at *rest* after the likeness of the One, who is truly at *rest* [...]" (59,18-23), cf. "[...] you may be able to *stand* [...]" (60:4), "[...] and I *stood* [...]" (60,22), "[...] when I wanted to *stand firmly* [...]" (60,28 f.), "[...] ὑπαρξις which I found *standing* and at *rest* like an image [...] of the Indivisible One [...]" (60,32-36).

After these rapture experiences or realizations ("And when I was confirmed in these matters [...]" 61,22 f.), Allogenes is again called upon not to hinder his inactivity by seeking incomprehensible things, "but *hear* about him" (i.e. about the "three-powerful one" of 61:21), insofar as this is possible through a "primary revelation" (61:28-31). The end of this revelatory speech is clearly stated: "And concerning all of these (things) you *have heard* certainly. And do not seek anything more, but go [...]" It is not fitting to spend more time seeking" (67:20-24. 33-39). "Hearing" and "not seeking" are the themes of the inclusion of the speech. Unfortunately, the first 14-16 lines on pages 65-69 have been completely destroyed,⁵⁴ so that the content of the conclusion of the speech about the One on page 67 is almost completely lost.

⁵³ The "Allogenes" is one of the treatises in NH (see note 22) and NH Stud. 28 in which the introduction and translation are divided between different authors.

⁵⁴ It is advisable to visualize this literally ad oculos by considering the brevity of these pages in NH Stud. 28,232-241 with the previous ones.

is missing entirely. The same applies to the commissioning of Allogenes by the orator (68) and Allogenes' address to his son Messos, with which the entire text ends on page 69.

Within the actual revelation discourse 61,32-67,20 there is a passage (62,28-63,25) that has a parallel in the philosophical section of John Apocrypha.⁵⁵ The parallel texts are not absolutely congruent (even those of John Apocrypha are not completely identical among themselves). The comparison shows that the text used for the second part of the

The expression "primary revelation", which is so characteristic of "allogenes" and which is suddenly found in our revelation speech in a different use than usual in the second part (63,14), is missing in John Apocr. together with some context.⁵⁶

I am struck by how abruptly this great speech of revelation begins in 61,32-62,6, characterized by astonishing paradoxes: "Now he is something insofar as he exists in that he either exists and will become or acts or [159] knows, although he lives without Mind or Life or Existence or Non-Existence, incomprehensibly. 62 And he is something along with his proper being. He is not left over in some way, as if he yields something that is assayed or purified [or that] receives or gives". In my opinion, this beginning, taken together with the request "listen" before and the conclusion

"you have heard" is an indication that the form of the revelatory speech serves to accommodate a quotation. The source, for its part, is already of the Barbelognostic, Platonizing kind, where the well-known triad is combined with the idea of the Triune One and the Invisible Spirit. It is difficult to determine who inserted the predication of

the supreme being as a "primary revelation" into this text. In the first part of the "Allogenes", the interpolated revelation was also a speech about the supreme being -

is this a characteristic of the genre? As a literary barbelognostic product, the

"Allogenes" is also a testimony to the constant over- and further development of Gnostic texts.

4) In "Zostrianus" there is another revelatory speech in addition to the exposé (with its parallel in Marius Victorinus), at a much earlier point in the text: page 14. Its beginning with "Hear" is easy to make out (VIII,1; 14,2), but not its end due to the miserable state of preservation. From the contents of page 15 it can be inferred that this particular message was no longer than page 14, perhaps ending on this page before. It is preceded on page 13 by an exchange of words between Zostrianus and the "child of the child, Ephesech". Zostrianus wants to be informed about the power of the baptismal water⁵⁷ and the "names in which we are baptized". Here is the answer: Sieber⁵⁸:

⁵⁵ See note 52 above.

⁵⁶ In 63,14 the supreme being itself is surprisingly referred to as the "primary revelation", whereas otherwise the "primary revelation" reports on him.

⁵⁷ 13,16: "Wasser" in Schenke, NH Deutsch II (as note 22), 642, Sieber, NH Libr ^{Engl3} (as note 22) has "mixture".

⁵⁸ NH Libr ^{Engl3} (see note 22), 407.

14 He said, "Zostrianus, *listen* about these, [...] for the *first* [...] *origins are three*, because they have appeared in a single origin [of] the Barbelo aeon, not like some origins and powers, nor like (one) from an origin and power. It is to every origin that they have appeared; they have strengthened every power; and they appeared from that which is far better than themselves. *These (three) are Existence, Blessedness and Life*⁵⁹. [...] [...] companions [...] in a [...] and concerning the [...] having named [...] more than ... [...] and [...] a perfect [...] from [...] a [...]". (Six illegible lines follow). Schenke⁶⁰:

14 And said, "Zostrianus, *hear* about [all] these! For there are *three pre[existent] origins* which have come into manifestation from one and the same origin, namely, the eon of Barbelo, not as origins and powers, nor as from one origin and one power, while they have made each one manifest and have endowed each power with power and have come into manifestation [from] that which is [much] better than them, which are: *being, [blessedness], and life*⁶¹. But these [while they are] manifest together [have come into manifestation] from one [and [160] the same] origin [...] and therefore [...] by being named [...] a perfect [...] one [origin ...]. "⁶²

On page 15 of "Zostrianus", the triad just revealed is assigned to the (baptismal) waters of the barbelognostic triad *Autogenes*, *Protophanes*, *Kalyptos* (this order is conditioned by the ascent of Zostrianus), 15,4-12: It is the water of *life* that belongs to *Vitality* in which you have *been baptized in the Autogenes*. It is in the [water] of *Blessedness* which belongs to Knowledge that you will *be baptized in the Protophanes*. It is in the water of *Existence* [which] belongs to *Divinity, the Kalyptos*.

The philosophical triad in its religious form is changed in its order to fit the fixed hierarchy of *Kalyptos*, *Protophanes*, *Autogenes*: *Kalyptos* - *Existence* (interpreted as *Protophanes* - *Blessedness/ Knowledge* (remembering that "Blessedness" stood in for the original "Intellect"), *Autogenes* material is thus inserted into the existing Gnostic grid, meaning that the Gnostic Triad is the earlier in development compared to the introduction of the Philosophical Triad. *The fact that this is an introduction, an insertion* of material taken *from outside* into one's own, is demonstrated by the means of introduction, namely that of revelation.

What I have just said about the constant revision of Gnostic texts on the occasion of the

"Allogenes" would have to be repeated here. There were no canonical books here,

⁵⁹ Note that the order Existence, Life, Blessedness is reversed here in members 2 and 3.

⁶⁰ Schenke, NH Deutsch II (see note 22), 642.

⁶¹ See note 59.

⁶² I have provided two translations of the same text here because they contain differences, The plausibility of the content of which is sometimes plausible on the one side, sometimes on the other; the right one must be decided on the basis of the Coptic.

The textual inventory was to be guarded, but rather new elements were incorporated into the older, existing writings in ways that were still literarily tangible. Where inserts present themselves as "revelations", they are not only authorized, but also claim oral immediacy - the irony lies in the fact that they are obviously quotations, i.e. literary dependencies.

This observation makes it quite unlikely that the writings whose titles appear both in the *Vita Plotini* of Porphyrius and among the NH treatises are completely identical in literary terms; rather, it can be assumed that they were subjected to more than one revision.

[161] III Chronological problems

In her introduction to "Allogenes" in NH Stud. 2863, Clark Wire has conscientiously discussed all the reasons that could argue against "Allogenes" having been available to the Plotinus in the same form as we know it from the NH texts (apart from the textual losses of the latter, of course). In the end, she decides in favor of the identification of both, with all the philosophical-historical consequences.⁶⁴

One of the reasons that can speak against the identification is the message in Epiphanius' *Panarion*, cited by Clark Wire, that there are several "Allogeneis".⁶⁵ These are reports no. 39 and no. 40 of the *Panarion*, about Sethians and Archontics. Epiphanius wrote the *Panarion* in the years from 374 to 377; his reports on still existing or already disappeared Gnostic groups and their localization thus concern the time in which the writings of NH were hidden and Marius Victorinus wrote his theological books. This justifies a (renewed) survey of the relevant chapters of the heresiologist.

Pan. No. 39,1,1: The Sethian sect is not found everywhere, *most of them* seem to have been "*uprooted*". 1,2: Epiphanius thinks he remembers that he encountered them "in the land of the Egyptians", but is no longer sure about this (geographical) point.⁶⁶ He has learned many things φύσει αὐτοψία about them,

⁶³ NH Studies 28, 173-191.

⁶⁴ I quote here only the conclusion of the introduction (191), but draw attention to the possible form of the verb

bums ("would allow"): "An Alexandrian origin of Allogenes would allow for whatever influence this text had on Platonists including Plotinus, the reverse influence in the demythologizing of gnostic thought in a Platonic direction, as well as the subsequent Bohairicised (upper Egyptian) Sahidic translation that we read".

⁶⁵ Clark Wire, NH Stud 28, 173 f.

⁶⁶ Should this uncertainty be explained by the fact that Epiphanius referred to his stay as a young man in Egypt about 335 years ago, about whom he reports in *Panarion* No. 26?

other things from their writings. The Sethians trace themselves back to Seth, whom they identify with Christ, with Jesus (they are therefore recognizably Christian Gnostics). - From Epiphanius' lecture on the doctrine of the Sethians, which runs together in 3,5, but is then interspersed with refutations, only "the upper power" (ἡ ἄνω δύναμις) is important for us; it is called "Mother" and "(the) Feminine". 5,1: They write *books* under the name of great men, *seven of them under the name of Seth*, *others call them Ἀλλογενεῖς*.

Pan. No. 40,1,1: The Archontics are reported "*not in many places*", with the exception of the province of Palestine. But now their poison has probably been brought to Greater Armenia; 1,2: in Lesser Armenia this weed has already been sown by a man named Eutactus. Epiphanius can date the activity of Eutactus: In the time of Constantius, towards the end of it (i.e. towards the year 361), Eutactus went from Armenia to Palestine, learned the κακοδιδασκαλία there and taught it in his homeland after his return. - This date brings us to [162] the last Palestinian period of Epiphanius, who went from Palestine to Salamis (Cyprus) as bishop in 367. - 1,3-1,7 within No. 40 is a digression about the Palestinian teacher of Eutactus, equipped with concrete location information, only the dating would be interesting. 1,3: The teacher is a γέρων, an "old man", named Peter, who lived in the area of Eleutheropolis⁶⁷ and Jerusalem, three miles beyond Hebron, in a village called Kephar Baricha. From 1:4 we get the following information, if we leave out the polemical stylization by Epiphanius: Peter wore a sheepskin, was an anachoret, lived in a cave, led many to ἀπόταξις, to "retreat" (from the world), and was called "father" because of his age and clothing, he had distributed his wealth among the poor and gave alms daily.⁶⁸ - Peter thus fully corresponds to the anachoret ideal, as drawn for example in the Vita Antonii of Athanasius, and is honored as such an anachoret. - Paragraphs 1,5-7 describe Peter's religious attitude and the church's reaction to it; 1,5: In his youth he belonged to "many sects". Under Bishop Aetius (Bishop of Eleutheropolis? Dates?) he was accused of belonging to the sect of the "Gnostics"⁶⁹, lost his presbyteral office and was expelled by Aetius; Peter went to Arabia, to Kokaba ("where the Ebionites and Nazoreans have their roots"). 1:6: Later (when?) the exile returned "as one who has become sensible at the approach of old age". But because of "words" that he had "whispered" into the ears of some (τινες), he was accused by Epiphanius, given the anathema and refuted. He then continued his anachoretic life in the cave, "despised" and left alone by "most" (i.e. not all!). - The intervention of Epiphanius naturally belongs in his

⁶⁷ Epiphanius himself came from Eleutheropolis, hence his good local knowledge.

⁶⁸ This presupposes that he acquired the necessary funds through manual labor for sale.

⁶⁹ One remembers that in Irenaeus the "Gnostics" are representatives of barbelognosis.

Palestinian period, i.e. before 367, but did this happen before or after Eutactus' visit to Peter?

I have reported all this in such detail because the idea that the NH texts might have been hidden by Christian monks causes astonishment and even offense. Here in Epiphanius' account we have a Palestinian Anachoret of irreproachable ascetic lifestyle, as a presbyter also an ecclesiastical minister, who is secretly a Christian Gnostic; two ecclesiastical interventions at probably greater intervals have not dissuaded him from his attitude. - Is no. 40,2,4 just a generalization of this one case? There it is said of the archontics in general that they fast and practise ἀποταξία as μονάζοντες, thereby influencing the "simpler ones". (I have stripped this sentence of Epiphanius' polemic).

Epiphanius returns with Pan. No.40,1,8 and 9 after his digression back to Eutactus. A significant reference concerning Eutactus' journey is added in 1,8: the Armenian came from Egypt when he went to see Peter. - Was he perhaps referred to Peter [163] in Egypt? - The place of origin of Eutactus in Lesser Armenia is also added: he comes from the region of Satale. 1,9: In his homeland, Eutaktus was very successful, and of great sociological interest, in the upper class: among the "rich", a "senatorial (lady)" and other "respected" people, which radiated from them to "many". Eutaktus soon died. - Those "respected ones" belong to the same class as the famous Cappadocian theologians and their families, their exact contemporaries. The work of Eutaktus among the distinguished Lesser Armenians probably presupposes that they were already Christians, but that the traveler provided them with Gnostic (secret) teachings (and probably also literature).

With Pan. No. 40,2,1 begins a long report on the literature and teachings of the Archontics. First, two of their books are mentioned: the "Little" and the "Great συμφωνία", certainly correctly translated by Frank Williams as "Harmony".⁷⁰

This is followed (still in 2,1) by a remark of a general nature, which describes the Gnostic literary establishment as a whole very accurately. "*They pile up certain other books, moreover, <and add these> to any they may light on, to give the appearance of confirming their own error through many*". Such adopted books include those named Ἀλλογενεῖς - the plural is confirmed in the next sentence:

"there are books that are called that". Epiphanius takes the teaching from the "Symphonia" (2,3); only the highest divine beings are of interest for our problems here. At the head of the Ogdoad is the Μητήρ φωτεινή (2,3). Later (2:8) we hear of the "superior mother and father of all". This father is the ἀκατάληπτος θεός (5:2). In 7:1 it is the ἄνω δύναμις who, with her assistants, raptured Seth; 7:3

⁷⁰ Frank Williams (transl.), The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis. Book I (Sects1-46). (NH Stud 35), Leiden 1987, 263.

she is called ἀκατονόμαστος δύναμις⁷¹, beside her "the good God above", "the one called by them ὁ ἄνω θεός" (7:9).

Incidentally, it is the seven sons of Seth who are called "Allogeneis" (7,5) - here the heresiologist refers to the earlier mentions of books of this name among the "Gnostics" and the "Sethians", i.e. to Pan. No. 26,8 and 39,5.

The lectures of Epiphanius prove the existence of Barbelognostics even in the second half of the 4th century; they have remained alive for two hundred years, if we place the report of Irenaeus at the beginning. The geographical details of the Bishop of Salamis lead us to Egypt, Palestine and (more recently, see Eutactus and his mission) to Asia Minor. (We hear nothing about Rome). Lesser Armenia borders on Cilicia, where the Neo-Arian Aetius suffered a depressing defeat at the beginning of his career in a dispute with a "Borborian" suffered, that was about 352.

[164] Despite his extensive knowledge of Gnostic writings, Epiphanius obviously did not encounter in them the barbelognostic group of supreme beings that we know as the "Triune (Spirit)", as Kalyptos, Protophanes, Auto- genes⁷² (the abundant occurrence of δύναμις in NH is not specific enough) to be completely silent about such philosophizing treatises as Nag Hammadi offers.⁷³ That the heresiologist does not have the Roman scene in mind is not surprising. But the Greek form of the NH treatises, which can be assumed to have originated in Alexandria, does not seem to have reached him either. Too esoteric, too young? One could argue that he knew about Eutactus' undertaking - but this took place on his doorstep, so to speak; there was probably little going on in Palestinian monastic circles that the curious Epiphanius remained unaware of.

The barbelognostics of Irenaeus (Adv. haer. I 29) and those of Epiphanius have the "mother" in common as the supreme magnitude in the otherworldly realm (Iren. I 29,3; Epiphanius see above), the "father" (29,1 and 3, here the triad mother, father, son; Epiphanius see above), the father "inominabilis" (29,1; in Epiphanius the δύναμις see above). However, the "virginalis spiritus" of Irenaeus (29,1 and 3), which is so important for NH and Marius Victorinus, is missing in Epiphanius' lectures. Also, Irenaeus' account already has the "(great) aeon" (also 29,1 and 3), which we find again in NH.

What we learn from Plotinus and Porphyrius about the Gnostics in Plotinus' school (of whom we have only known since the NH finds that they were *bar-*

⁷¹ On such negative predicates as "inconceivable" and "unnameable", see recently Chiara O. Tommasi Moreschini, *Viae negationis della dossologia divina nel medioplatonismo e nello gnosticismo tset- hiano (con echi in Mario Vittorino)*, in: Francesca Calabi (ed.), *Arrhetos theos. L'ineffabilità del primo*

principio nel medioplatonismo, Pisa 2002, 110-150.

⁷² Autogenes already in Irenaeus for the Logos, I 29,2.

⁷³ No doubt he would have accused their authors of arrogance. - What Epiphanius actually are borrowings from Greek mythology, Pan. No. 26,2,4; 16,6 and 8.

belognostics) is not only an increase in our knowledge of this Gnostic movement, but also reveals a development in its writing and teaching since the writings of Irenaeus. This development must include the characteristic names of revelation recipients in the titles of the NH treatises, as we then encounter them again in other sources (not always in this function). We can determine the body of doctrine of the barbelognostics in Plotinus' school on the basis of the literary relationships between Plotinus' criticism and barbelognostic writings transmitted in Coptic. Here is the list as presented by Clark Wire in her introduction to the "Allogenes" in NH Stud 28:74 "There are a number of features present in the *Allogenes* text group that are attacked by Plotinus. He is suspicious of the cultic elements, particularly what he calls 'incantations' (*Allogenes* XI,3: 53,37-54,37; *Three Steles of Seth*, passim) and 'magical hissings' (*Allogenes* XI,3: 53,36-37; *Zost.* VIII,1: 127,1-5; *Marsanes* X: 31,22-32,4). He ridicules their invention of new jargon including παροίκησις (transmigration), ἀντίτυποις (antitypes) and μετάνοια (repentance) (*Enn.* II.9.6; the only known gnostic occurrences of this triad are in *Zost.* VIII, 1: 8,10-18; 12,9-22; and in the Untitled text of the *Bruce Codex*, 51,7-10; Schmidt-[165]MacDermot, *Bruce Codex*, 263,20-2275)." In addition, there are the lines on the distinction between *dynamis* and *energeia* in Plotinus and in "Zostrianus", as juxtaposed by Tardieu.⁷⁶ - Incidentally, it is interesting (not mentioned by Clark Wire) that the Gnostics gave the Master a significant explanation of the aforementioned termini as the suffering of the soul,⁷⁷

⁷⁴ NH Stud 28, 187.

⁷⁵ On "Zostrianus" and the Bruce Codex, see my essay "Nag Hammadi 8,1 'Zostrianus', the Anonymum Brucanum, Plotinus *Enn.* 2,9 (33)", in: FS Heinrich Dörrie (JAC Erg. Bd. 10), Münster 1983, 1-10, reprinted in my anthology "Formula und Context", Aldershot 1992 as no. XII; for the correct translation of παροίκησις with "exile" see there 3.

⁷⁶ Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note 1), 112; cited above, note 37 - Incidentally I find that Armstrong's translation of Plotinus *Enn.* II 9 (33), 1,23 Οὐ γὰρ δὴ [...] φήσουσι with "For they will not assert that [...]" does not exactly capture the nuance of Plotinian irony, because Armstrong translates only the first of the two particles γὰρ δὴ. However, δὴ in connection with οὐ is decisive; this results in "They will not (want to) say that...", English perhaps "They certainly will not (want to) assert that [...]", because that would be γελοῖον (line 24).

⁷⁷ Plotinus *Enn.* II 9 (33), 6,3-7: "For if they call this (ταῦτα) suffering of the soul, if they call themselves is in repentance, and 'antitypes', when it sees, as it were, images of the existent, but not the existents themselves, then they use a new language to fortify their own direction". (Plotinus makes no such reference to the παροίκησις). - Does this passage refer to "Zostrianus 12,5-13,6? In Sieber, NH Libr^{Engl3} (see note 22), 407, it reads: "Those who receive a model of their souls are still in the world. They came into being after the departure of the aeons, one by one, and they are removed one by one from the copy of Exile to the Exile that really exists, from the copy of Repentance to the Repentance that really exists [and from the] copy of Autogenes to [the Autogenes] that really exists". - "That really exists" should be ὁ/τὸ ὄντως ὄν/ὤν. I give here the t r a n s l a t i o n of Schenke, NH Deutsch II (as note 22), 642, because of the differences with Sieber, NH Libr^{Engl3} (as note 22) in the first half of the passage. "And the humble souls exercise themselves through the counter-images, they who receive an imprint of their souls while they are still in the world. According to

thus gave an exoteric explanation of their topoi, as we occasionally hear from them.⁷⁸

However, the presence of the listed barbelognostic teachings in Plotinus and in NH texts does not allow the automatic conclusion that everything else that we only know from NH and Marius Victorinus should be projected back to that earlier time and to the writings with identical names in their original form. However, from Plotinus' criticism and from the Coptic parallels, we can ascertain what has been held since the middle of the 3rd century as a fixed body of doctrine by the barbelognostic school that is attested for the Plotinian period in Rome. The constant reference to [166] "Zostrianus" loses its persuasive power in view of the unstable form of Gnostic writings, among which "Zostrianus" is no exception.

As for the philosophy that the "Platonizing" treatises of the NH-Fundamentals make use of, it can neither be derived directly from Plotinus nor even have served as a source for Plotinus. On this point, what Majercik wrote in 1992 remains valid.⁷⁹ Taking the triad existence, life, intellect (together with variants) as a summarizing characteristic of this metaphysics, and considering the fact that the triad is not attested before Plotinus as a chronological date, she gives the following reasons why Plotinus cannot have played either role: "First of all, the various triads found in gnostic texts often appear in an explicit and fixed form that is not a feature in Plotinus' writings, where the triad remains implicit. Second, in the gnostic texts, the first term of the triad is regularly understood as ὑπαρξίς, a term that has no special significance - triadically or otherwise - for Plotinus. Third, some of the variant terms used in the gnostic texts for the three members of the triad (e. g. Substantiality, Vitality, Mentality) reflect a method of paronyms that is uncharacteristic of Plotinus. This is also the case with the principles of implication and predominance which describe the relation between the three members of the triad. These principles play a minor role, if any at all, in Plotinus' metaphysics. Thus an 'exchange' of ideas between Plotinus and the gnostics, based on the triadic concerns expressed in these Nag Hammadi texts, appears to be more problematic than useful. A shift focus is needed. Since there is no compelling reason why any of these gnostic texts, in the form we now have them, must predate or even be contemporaneous with Plotinus, a more fruitful line of inquiry is

the path of emergence, they arise in correspondence to each individual: from the counter-image of the abode" (etc.) - from here on, the German translation is analogous to the English one. - Is the insistence on the "truly existent" a reaction to Plotinus? Or did Plotinus only refer to the first of the two stages of the soul? The first possibility, i.e. a reaction to Plotinus, would of course be the more interesting one.

⁷⁸ Irenaeus Adv. Haer. II 15,3. See Abramowski, Nag Hammadi 8,1 "Zostrianus" (see note 76), 8.

⁷⁹ Ruth Majercik, The Existence-Life-Intellect triad in gnosticism and Neoplatonism, in: Classical Quarterly 42, 1992, 475-488, here 476.

to pursue parallels with a successor of Plotinus". Porphyrius fits best in terms of time.

In 1992, Majercik was convinced of Porphyrius' authorship of the anonymous Turin Parmenides commentary (only remnants of which still exist) on the basis of Hadot's arguments; Hadot himself (1996) continues to uphold this authorship. And those experts who deny the commentary to Porphyrius place it in his circle, which perhaps allows this work to be dated around the year 300. As is well known, the Anonymus Taurinensis is the text in which a pagan philosopher, who is therefore neither Christian, nor Gnostic nor Christian-Gnostic, presents the metaphysics used by the Barbary lognostics, who are therefore described as "Platonizing", and which finally appears in Marius Victorinus' antiarian writings in the astonishing form I have described elsewhere.

The presence of Barbelognostics in Plotinus' school testifies not only to the philosophical interest of the representatives of this group in general and in general, but especially to their *interest in the latest, current debate on metaphysics* (today one would fashionably say philosophical discourse); they undoubtedly saw themselves as equal participants in [167] this debate.⁸⁰ The adoption of the philosophy represented by the Anonymus Taurinensis by the Barbelian Gnostics a few decades later can again be interpreted as participation in the then current discussion on metaphysics. Just as Plotinus complained at the time that this group of his listeners did not want to give up their own doctrines, we see these younger Barbelognostics, according to their writings, *adding* the philosophical material relevant to them to the mythological and literary material that continued to be handed down. This addition can occur in various literary ways, as the above analyses have shown. Their intention is the philosophical *interpretation* of the Gnostic mythological lumina, which should not be made to disappear, but rather made plausible and acceptable.

The interpretation of the barbelognostic triad Kalyptos, Protophanes, Autogenes through the triad Existence, Life, Intellect/Soul (which, by the way, is done quite inconsistently, if it is done explicitly at all), presupposes the existence of that Gnostic triad, which, however, is not yet known to us from the older sources. Here we can see an inner development (towards a clearer structure and nomenclature in the area of the first principles).

According to the literary evidence available to us, the development of the philosophizing barbelognostics in Rome and Egypt in the processing of the

⁸⁰ For this occasion they undertook the outward dechristianization of writings presented to them, see my essays of 1983 - A distinction between non-Christian and Christian representatives of the group is made by the philosophical prelude to the John Apocryphon ad absurdity.

The fact that the same material was used in certain NH treatises *and* in Marius Victorinus cannot, however, be overestimated in its significance for the dating question. With the theological writings of the Roman rhetorician, we have a fixed terminus ad quem: his writings were composed between 357 and 363.⁸² The age of the material books that make up the NH find is not so far removed from this. The filling material of the cover of NH VII (all possible remains of letters and documents on papyrus) provides dates for the years 341, 346 and 348.⁸³ "This indicates that the cover of Codex VII was manufactured no earlier than the latest date, but perhaps as much as a generation after these dates". Robinson cites Athanasius' Easter letter of 367 as a possible reason for the concealment of the codices,⁸⁴ in which the heretics and their apocryphal books are condemned; he also recalls the measures taken by Abbot Shenute of the White Monastery [168] at the beginning of the 5th century against a group in the nearby temple of Pneuith.⁸⁵ The vocabulary of these people appears gnostic, and they are also unwilling to submit to the theological authority of the Alexandrian archbishop Cyril. Shenute threatens them with punitive military action.

We therefore have a terminus a quo for the *bindings* of the codices: 348, and as the latest possible date for their concealment the beginning of the 5th century. This terminus a quo brings us to the time of Victorinus. And when in Cod. VI 40.7 f. warns of the Anhomoeans as an evil heresy, the codices could not have been buried in the late 50s.⁸⁶

This requires an astonishingly late terminus ad quem for the bound Coptic manuscripts, which unfortunately cannot be precisely fixed, provided they were copied specifically for these volumes. Let us take the beginning of the 4th century (presumed

81 On the Roman representatives of the movement who had become Nicene and were no longer recognizable as Gnostic to Victorinus, see Abramowski, *Niceneism and Gnosticism* (see note 2), 559 below - 562 [here in this volume pp. 458-461].

82 See Hadot's introduction to SC 68 - On the difficulty of recognizing the beginning of the "secret" treatment.

Victorinus' involvement with Christianity, see there 14 (after 351?).

83 Robinson, Introduction to NH Libr ^{Engl}3 (see note 22), 16.

84 Robinson, Introduction to NH Libr ^{Engl}3 (see note 22), 19.

85 Robinson, Introduction to NH Libr ^{Engl}3 (see note 22), 20.

86 Robinson, Introduction to NH Libr ^{Engl}3 (see note 22), 16. The statement applies regardless of this, whether the sentence in question is an addition or not. Stephen Gero, With Walter Bauer on the Tigris: Encratite orthodoxy and libertine heresy in Syro-Mesopotamian Christianity, in: Charles W. Hedrick/Robert Hodgson, Jr. (eds.), *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism and early Christianity*, Peabody (Mass.) 1986, 287-307, here 296 note 49, refers to various other translations of the corresponding Coptic *v e r s e s* ("unequal things" etc.); but these renderings do not take into account the next two lines: "evil heresies that have no basis". - On Anhomoeans (= Eunomians) as opponents of the Barbelo-Gnostics, see Tardieu/Hadot, *Recherches sur la formation* (see note 1), 23. 125 and Abramowski, *Niceneism and Gnosticism* (see note 2), 555-558 [here in this volume pp. 454-457]. - The author would like to thank Dr. Mechthild Kellermann for library assistance and Dr. Felix Thome for the PC transcription.

If we accept the Anonymus Taurinensis approach as the terminus a quo for the process leading from the philosophical editing of existing barbelognostic Greek treatises to their Coptic translation found in Nag Hammadi, then several decades are available for the various technical stages that were necessary for the final result. There is therefore no chronological necessity to date the Greek originals on which the Coptic translation is based back to a time before 300, with the known consequences for the dating of the anonymous Parmenides commentary. The "Zostrianus", which Plotinus knew, only became the "Zostrianus" through revision, which is accessible to us today in a very destroyed form. It and the "Allogenes" can therefore not be promoted as a source of Plotinian thought.

List of places of first publication

- 1.1 86. to the planned edition of Brit. Mus. add. 12156, in: J. Dummer (ed. in conjunction with J. Irmscher, F. Paschke, K. Treu): *Texte und Textkritik. A collection of essays, Texte und Untersuchungen* 133, Berlin 1987, 23-28.
- 1.2 75 The Anakephalaiosis to the Panarion of Epiphanius in the manuscript Brit. Mus. add. 12156, *Le Muséon* 96 (1983) 217-230.
- 1.3 107 On the fragments of Theodor of Mopsuestia in Brit. Libr. add. 12.156 and the doubly transmitted Christological fragment, *Oriens Christianus* 79 (1995) 1-8 (version of nr. 100 extended by footnotes: On the fragments of Theodore of Mopsuestia in Brit. Libr. add. 12.156 and the christological fragment in double tradition, *The Harp* 6, no. 3 (1993) 199-206).
- 1.4 109 The remains of the Syriac translation of Theodor of Mopsuestia, *De incarnatione*, in Add. 14.669, *ARAM 5 (A Festschrift for Dr. Sebastian P. Brock)* (1993) [published 1996] 23-32.
- 1.5 Theodor von Mopsuestia, fragments from the manuscript add. 12156 of the British Museum, translated and explained [Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen, Nachlass Luise Abramowski].
- 2.1 57 The Christology of Babai the Great, in: *Symposium Syriacum 1972, célébré dans les jours 26-31 octobre 1972 à l'Institut pontifical de Rome, Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 197, Rome 1974, 219-245.
- 2.2 58 Babai the Great: Christological Problems and their Solutions, in: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 41 (1975) 289-343 [continuation of no. 57].
- 3.1 110 The liturgical homily of Ps. Narses with the profession of the Mass and a quotation from Theodore, *BJRL* 78 (1996) 87-100.
- 3.2 116 On the writings of Michael Malpana / Badoqa, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 89, Rome 1999, 1-10.
- 3.3 117 Narsai, Ephrem and Cyril on Jesus' cry of abandonment Matth. 27,46, in: H. J. Feulner (ed.), *Crossroad of Cultures. Studies in liturgy and patristics in honor of G. Winkler, Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 260, Rome 2000, 43-67.
- 3.4 118 "The stupor that interrupts prayer". Euagrius, *Cent. Suppl.* 30, in translation, original (?) and interpretation, in: M. Tamcke, A. Heinz (eds.), *Zu Geschichte, Theologie, Liturgie und Gegenwartslage der syrischen Kirchen. Selected Lectures of the German Symposium of Syriacs from October 2-4, 1998 in Hermannsburg, Studien zur Orientalischen Kirchengeschichte* 9, Münster 2000, 15-32.
- 3.5 137 Martyrius-Sahdona and Dissent in the Church of the East, in: *Controverses des Chrétiens dans l'Iran sassanide. Textes réunis par Christelle Jullien, Cahiers de Studia Iranica* 36, Paris 2008, 13-27.
- 3.6 138 Die nachephesinische Christologie der edessenischen Theodorianer, in: L. Greisiger, C. Rammelt, J. Tubach (eds.), *Edessa in Hellenistic-Roman Times: Religion, Culture and Politics between East and West. Beiträge des internationalen Edessa-Symposiums in Halle an der Saale, July 14-17, 2005, Beiruter Texte und Studien* 116, Würzburg 2009, 1-9.
- 3.7 141 The Bishop of Seleukia-Ktesiphon as Catholicos and Patriarch, in: D. Bumazhnov, H. R. Seeliger (eds.), *Syrien im 1.-7. Jahrhundert nach Christus: Akten der 1. Tübinger Tagung zum Christlichen Orient, June 15-16, 2007, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum* 62, Tübingen 2011, 1-55.
- 4.1 14 An unknown quotation from *Contra Eunomium* by Theodor of Mopsuestia, *Le Muséon* (1958) 97-104.
- 4.2 39 Ps. Nestorius and Philoxenus of Mabbug, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 77 (1966) 122-125.
- 4.3 96 Dadisho Qatraya and his Commentary on the Book of the Abbas Isaia, *The Harp* 4 (1991) 67-83.

- 5.1 95 The Third Arian Discourse of Athanasius. Eusebians and Arians and the Western Serdicense, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 102 (1991) 387-413.
- 5.2 99 What does the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum (C) have to do with the Council of Constantinople in 381?, *Theology and Philosophy* 67 (1992) 481-513.
- 5.3 103 The History of Research into Nestorius, in: A. Stirnemann/G. Wilfinger (eds.): *Syriac Dialogue. First Non-Official Consultation on Dialogue within the Syriac Tradition*, Vienna 1994, 54-65 [according to Luise Abramowski, incorrect printing, corrections were found in the estate and will be taken into account].
- 5.4 105 Der Christusglaube der Konzilien, in: W. Brandmüller (ed.), *Wer ist Jesus Christus? Myths, Faith and History*, Aachen 1995, 237-273.
- 5.5 111 The Spirit as a "bond" between Father and Son - a theologoumenon of the Eusebians, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 87 (1996) 126-132.
- 5.6 128 The Session of the Council of Ephesus on July 22, 431, "On the Attachment of the Symbol of the Holy Fathers in Nicaea and on the Libellus Delivered by the Presbyter Charisius," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 115 (2004) 382-390.
- 5.7 129 Nicenism and Gnosticism in the Rome of Bishop Liberius. The case of Marius Victorinus, *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum* 8 (2005) 513-566.
- 5.8 131 Concilium Ephesenum 431, in: *The Oecumenical Councils. From Nicaea I to Nicaea II (325-787)*. Editio critica, edidit G. Alberigo, *Corpus Christianorum. Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta* 1, Turnhout 2006, only the introduction = 73-80.
- 5.9 133 "Audi, ut dico". Literary observations and chronological considerations on Marius Victorinus and the "platonizing" Nag Hammadi treatises, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 117 (2006) 145-168.

Bibliography

Individual references to the texts edited in the major source corpora (ACO, CCSL, CCSG, CSCO, CSEL, GCS, PG, PL, PO, PS, SC) have been omitted here; for these (and also for the corresponding references to the classical Greek and Latin authors cited), please consult the Index of References [the editor].

- Abbeloos, J. B. / Lamy, Th. J., Gregorii Barhebraei chronicon ecclesiasticum, Louvain 1872-77.
- Abramowski, L. / Goodman, A. E.: A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts, Cambridge 1972.
- Abramowski, L., / Goodman, A., Luke xxiii. 46 παρατίθεμαι in a Rare Syriac Rendering, New Testament Studies 13 (1967) 290-291.
- Abramowski, L., Aus dem Streit um das 'Unus ex trinitate passus est': Der Protest des Habib gegen die Epistula dogmatica des Philoxenus an die Mönche, in: A. Grillmeier / Th. Hainthaler (eds.), Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche 2/3, Freiburg 2002, 570-647.
- Abramowski, L., Das Bekenntnis des Gregor Thaumaturgus bei Gregor von Nyssa und das Problem seiner Echtheit, Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 87 (1976) 145-166.
- Abramowski, L., Die Synode von Antiochien 324/5 und ihr Symbol, Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 86 (1975) 356-366.
- Abramowski, L., Dionys of Rome († 258) and Dionys of Alexandria († 264/5) in the Arian disputes of the 4th century. Journal of Church History 93 (1982) 240-272.
- Abramowski, L., Ein gnostischer Logos-theologe. Umfang und Redaktor des gnostischen Sonderguts in Hippolyts "Widerlegung aller Häresien", this, Drei christologische Untersuchungen (BZNW 45), Berlin 1981, 18-62.
- Abramowski, L., Marius Victorinus, Porphyrius und die römischen Gnostiker, Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 74 (1983) 108-128.
- Abramowski, L., Nag Hammadi 8,1 'Zostrianus', das Anonymum Brucanum, Plotin Enn. 2.9 (33), in: H.-D. Blume/F. Mann (eds.), Platonism and Christianity. FS Heinrich Dörrie (Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Erg. Bd. 10), Münster 1983, 1-10.
- Abramowski, L., Narsai, Homily XI, The Harp. A Review of Syriac and Oriental Studies 20 (2006) (= FS Jakob Thekeparampil) 333-348.
- Abramowski, L., On the fragments of Theodore of Mopsuestia in Brit. Libr. add. 12156 and the christological fragment in double tradition, The Harp. A Review of Syriac and Oriental Studies 6 (1993) 199-206.
- Abramowski, L., Remains of Theodoret's Apology for Diodorus and Theodore in Facundus, Studia Patristica I [published 1957] (= Texte und Untersuchungen 63), 61-69.
- Abramowski, L., review of Wanda Wolska: La topographie chrétienne de Cosmas Indicopleustès. Théologie et science au VI^e siècle. (= Bibliothèque Byzantine. Études 3). Paris (Presses Universitaires de France) 1962. XVI, 329 p., XV plates in card. NF 40,-, in: Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 76 (1965) 163-164.
- Abramowski, L., Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius (CSCO 242, Subsidia 22), Louvain 1963.
- Abramowski, L., Zum Brief des Andreas von Samosata an Rabbula von Edessa, Oriens christianus 41 (1957) 51-64.
- Abramowski, L., Zur Theologie Theodors von Mopsuestia, Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 72 (1961) 263-293.
- Abramowski, L., Zur Trinitätslehre des Thomas von Aquin, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 92 (1995) 466-480.

- Abramowski, L., Συνάφεια und ἀσύγχυτος ἔνωσις als Bezeichnungen für trinitarische und christologische Einheit, in: this, *Drei christologische Untersuchungen* (BZNW 45), Berlin 1981, 63-109.
- Abramowski, L., Συνάφεια und ἀσύγχυτος ἔνωσις als Bezeichnung für trinitarische und christologische Einheit, in: this, *Drei christologische Untersuchungen* (BZNW 45), Berlin 1981, 63-109.
- Abramowski, R., Der theologische Nachlaß des Diodor von Tarsus, *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 42 (1949) 19-69.
- Abramowski, R., Neue Schriften Theodors von Mopsuestia (†428), *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 33 (1934) 66-84.
- Adam, A., *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte I*, Gütersloh 1965.
- Ahrens, K. / Krüger, G., *Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor*, Leipzig 1899.
- Altaner, B. / Stuiber, A., *Patrologie: Leben, Schriften und Lehre der Kirchenväter*, 9th edition, Freiburg et al. 1980.
- Amann, E., L'affaire Nestorius vue de Rome, *Revue des sciences religieuses* 23 (1949) 5-7. 207-244. 24 (1950) 28-52. 235-265.
- Anastos, M. V., Nestorius was orthodox, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 16 (1962) 117-140.
- Baarda, Tj., A Syriac fragment of Mar Ephraem's Commentary on the Diatessaron. *New Testament Studies* 8 (1961/2) 287-300.
- Baltes, M., Marius Victorinus. Zur Philosophie in seinen Theologischen Schriften (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 174), Leipzig/Stuttgart 2002.
- Barbel, J., review of Luise Abramowski. *Studies on the "Liber Heraclidis" of Nestorius.* (*Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium*, n° 242/Subsidia, 22.) Louvain, Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 49, chaussée de Wavre, 1963. In-8, II-233p. Fr. b. 380, *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 60 (1965) 494-500.
- Bardy, G.: *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche et son école*, Paris 1936.
- Battifol, P., Les présents de saint Cyrille à la cour de Constantinople", *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétienne* 1 (1912) 247-264.
- Bauer, Joh.: *Corpora orbiculata. Eine verschollene Origenesexegese bei Pseudo-Hieronymus*, *Zeitschr. f. kath. Theologie* 82 (1960) 333-341.
- Baumstark, A., *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn 1922.
- Bebis (Μπέμπης), Georgios, *Contributions to the research on Nestorius, from the orthodox viewpoint*, Athens 1964.
- Bedjan, P. (ed.), *Histoire de Mar-Jabalah*, Paris, 1895.
- Bedjan, P. (ed.), *Mar Isaacus Ninivita, De perfectione religiosa*. Paris/Leipzig 1909.
- Bedjan, P. (ed.), *Nestorius, Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas*. Paris/Leipzig 1910.
- Beulay, R., *L'enseignement spirituel de Jean de Dalyatha, mystique syro-orientale du VIIIe siècle*, Paris 1990.
- Blum, G. G., *Rabbula von Edessa* (CSCO 300, Subs. 34), Louvain 1969.
- Börtzler, F., *Porphyrios' Schrift von den Götterbildern*, Diss. Erlangen 1903.
- Bou Mansour, T., Die Christologie des Jacob von Sarug, in: Grillmeier, A. / Hainthaler, Th. (eds.), *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche II 3: Die Kirchen von Jerusalem und Antiochien nach 451 bis 600*, Freiburg im Breisgau u. a. 2002, 449-499.
- Bou Mansour, T., *La théologie de Jacques de Saroug II: Christologie, trinité, eschatologie, méthode exégétique et théologique*, Kaslik 2000 (Bibliothèque de l'Université Saint-Esprit), Kaslik, Liban, 40.
- Braun, O., *Selected Acts of Persian Martyrs. With an appendix: Ostsyrisches Mönchsleben* (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter 22), Kempten/München 1915.
- Braun, O., *Der Briefwechsel des Katholikos Papa von Seleucia. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der ostsyrischen Kirche im vierten Jahrhundert*, *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 18 (1894) 163-182 (translated texts). 546-565 (investigation).

- Brennecke, H. C.: Erwägungen zu den Anfängen des Neunizänismus, D. Papandreou/W. A. Bienert/K. Schäferdiek (eds.), *Œcumenica et Patristica* (FS W. Schneemelcher), Chambésy-Geneva 1989, 241-257.
- Brrière, M., *Fragments syriaques de Diodore de Tarse*, *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 30 (1946) 231-283.
- Brisson, L., Amélius. Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa doctrine, son style, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 36,2, Berlin / New York 1987, 793-860.
- Brock, S., A further fragment of the Sinai Sahdona manuscript, *Le Muséon* 81 (1968) 139-154.
- Brock, S., Clothing metaphors as a means of theological expression in Syriac tradition, in: M. Schmidt (ed.), *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihre Parallelen im Mittelalter*, Regensburg 1982, 11-38.
- Brock, S., Diachronic aspects of Syriac word formation: an aid for dating anonymous texts, V. Symposium Syriacum 1988 (*Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 236), Rome 1990, 321-30. Brock, S., *Studies in Syriac Christianity* (Coll. Stud. Series 357), Aldershot 1992.
- Brock, S., The christology of the Church of the East in the Synods of the fifth to early seventh century: preliminary considerations and materials, Aksum-Thyateira. Festschrift Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain, Athens 1985, 125-42.
- Bruns, P.: Bemerkungen zur Rezeption des Nicaenums in der ostsyrischen Kirche, *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 32 (2000) 1-22.
- Budge, E. A. W. (ed.), *The Book of the Bee*, Oxford 1886.
- Campenhausen, H. von, Das Bekenntnis im Urchristentum, in: *hes., Urchristliches und Altkirchliches*, Tübingen 1979, 249-253.
- Caspari, C. P., Das Taufbekenntnis der Nestorianer aus Cod. orient. 147 of the Königliche Hofbibliothek zu München, in: *ders., Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel I*, Christiania 1866, 113-42 = Nr. V.
- Chabot, J.-B. (ed.), *Synodicon Orientale*, Paris 1902.
- Chollet, A., Art. animation, *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* I/2 (1923) 1305-1320.
- Clark Wire, A., Introduction NHC XI,3: *Allogenes*, 45,1-69,20, in: Ch. W. Hedrick (ed.): *Nag Hammadi Codices XI, XII, XIII* (The Coptic Gnostic Library), Nag Hammadi Studies 28, Leiden 1990, 173-191.
- Connolly, R. H., *The liturgical homilies of Narsai* (Texts and Studies, VIII.1), Cambridge 1909. Courcelle, P., *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin*, Paris 1950.
- Crouzel, H., La passion de l'impassible. Un essai apologétique et polémique du III^e siècle, in: *L'homme devant dieu. Mélanges H. de Lubac I*, Paris 1963, 269-279.
- Daley, B. E.: *Leontius of Byzantium. A critical Edition of his Works with Prolegomena*, Diss. Oxford 1978 (unpublished).
- Denzinger, H. / Schönmetzer, A.: *Enchiridion symbolorum* (...), Barcelona u. a. 361976 (371991 ed. Hünemann).
- Devreesse, R., *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste* (Studi e testi 141), Città del Vaticano 1948. Diettrich, G., *Die nestorianische Taufliturgie*, Giessen 1903.
- Dörrie, H., *Porphyrios' 'Symmikta Zetemata'*, Munich 1959.
- Dörrie, H., Une exégèse néoplatonicienne du prologue de l'évangile de saint Jean (Amélius chez Eusèbe, *Prép. Év.* 11,19,1-4), in: J. Fontaine/Ch. Kannengiesser (eds.), *Epektasis*, FS Jean Daniélou, Paris 1972, 75-87 (= *ders., Platonica minora*, Munich 1976, 491-507).
- Dossetti, G. L.: *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Constantinopoli. Edizione critica*, Rome 1967.
- Driver, G. R. / Hodgson, L., *The Bazaar of Heraclides*, Oxford 1925.
- Ebied, R. Y. / Wickham, L. R., A collection of unpublished Syriac letters of Timothy Aelurus, *Journal of Theological Studies* N. S. 21 (1970) 321-369.
- Ebied, R. Y. / Wickham, L. R., Timothy Aelurus: Against the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 18 (1985) 115-166.

- Feghali, J., Perspectives sur l'histoire et l'institution des patriarches orientaux, in: *Mélanges Jean Dauvillier*, Toulouse 1979, 269-292.
- Festugière, A. J., *Actes du concile de Chalcédoine*, Geneva 1983.
- Festugière, A. J., *Ephèse et Chalcédoine. Actes des conciles*, Paris 1982.
- Fiey, J.-M., *Chrétientés syriaques du Ḥorasan et Ségéstān*, *Museon* 86 (1973) 75-104 (= ders., *Communautés syriaques en Iran et Irak des origines à 1552*, *Variorum* 1979, no. VI).
- Fiey, J.-M., Ṭšō'yaw le grand. Vie du catholicos nestorien Ṭšō'yaw III d'Adiabène (580-659), *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 35 (1969) 305-333.
- Fiey, J.-M., Ṭšō'yaw le grand. Vie du catholicos nestorien Ṭšō'yaw III d'Adiabène (580-659), *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 36 (1970) 5-46.
- Fiey, J.-M., Les étapes de la prise de conscience de son identité patriarcale par l'église syrienne orientale, *L'Orient Syrien* 12 (1967) 3-22 (= ders., *Jalons pour une histoire de l'église en Iraq* [CSCO 310, Subs. 36], Louvain 1970, Chap. III: *Catholicat et patriarcat*, 66-84).
- Fiey, J.-M., Nisibe, métropole syriaque orientale et ses suffragants des origines à nos jours (CSCO 388, *Subsidia* 54), Louvain, 1977.
- Fiey, J.-M., Topographie chrétienne de Mahoze, in: ders., *Communautés syriaques en Iran et Irak des origines à 1552*, *Variorum* 1979, 397-420.
- Flemming, J., *Akten der ephesinischen Synode vom Jahre 449*. Syrisch hrsg., mit Georg Hoffmanns dt. Übersetzung und seinen Anmerkungen, Berlin 1917 (Nachdruck Göttingen 1970).
- Frankenberg, W., *Euagrius Ponticus. Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, N. F. 13.2*, Berlin 1912, 1-635.
- Frishman, J., *The ways and means of the divine economy. An edition, translation and study of six biblical homilies by Narsai*, Dissertation Leiden 1992.
- Furlani, G., 'Il libro delle definizioni e divisioni' di Michele l'interprete, *Atti della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, serie 6, vol. 2 (1926) 5-194.
- Furlani, G., Il manoscritto siriano 9 dell'India Office, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 10 (1923-25) 315-320.
- Geerard, M., *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, vol. III, Turnhout 1979 (22003).
- Gero, S., *Baršāuma of Nisibis and Persian Christianity in the fifth century* (CSCO 426, Subs. 63), Louvain 1981.
- Gerö, S., The Anti-Ascetic Movement in Persian Christianity - Influence of Zoroastrian Ethics? III. Symposium Syriacum 1980 (*Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 221), Rome 1983, 187-191.
- Gero, S., The see of Peter in Babyton: Western influences on the ecclesiology of early Eastern Christianity, in: N. G. Garsoian / Th. F. Mathews / R. W. Thomson (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the formative period*, *Dumbarton Oaks* 1982, 45-51.
- Gero, S., With Walter Bauer on the Tigris: Encratite orthodoxy and libertine heresy in Syro-Mesopotamian christianity, in: Ch. W. Hedrick / R. Hodgson, Jr. (eds.), *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism and early Christianity*, Peabody (Mass.) 1986, 287-307.
- Goodman, A. E., Examination of some Nestorian Kephalaia (Or. University Library, Cambridge), in: D. Wynton Thomas (ed.), *Essays and Studies presented to Stanley Arthur Cook* (*Cambridge Oriental Series*, No. 2), London 1950, 73-83.
- Goodman, A. E., The Jenks Collection of Syriac Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (Oct. 1939) 596-8.
- Grillmeier, A., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, London 1965.
- Grillmeier, A., Das scandalum oecumenicum des Nestorius in kirchlich-dogmatischer und theologiegeschichtlicher Sicht, *Scholastik* 26 (1961) 321-56.
- Grillmeier, A., *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* 1 (3rd ed.), Freiburg etc. 1990.
- Grillmeier, A., *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* 2/1, Freiburg etc. 1986.
- Guillaumont, A., Iustinien et l'Église de Perse, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23/24 (1969/1970) 39-66.

- Guillaumont, A., *Les 'Kephalaia Gnostica' d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les grecs et les syriens*, Paris 1962.
- Habbi, J., *La structure patriarcale de l'église*, in: R. Coppola (ed.), *Atti del congresso internazionale Incontro fra Canonici d'Oriente e d'Occidente*, Bari 1994, 157-182.
- Hadot, P., *La notion de Dieu "causa sui" chez Marius Victorinus Afer*, thèse Paris (Institut Catholique) 1950.
- Hadot, P., *Porphyre et Victorinus I*, Paris 1968.
- Hadot, P., *Textes porphyriens de l'œuvre théologique de Marius Victorinus, Groupe II (= ders. Porphyre et Victorinus II, Paris 1968) 27-29.*
- Hage, W., *Das orientalische Christentum (Die Religionen der Menschheit 29,2)*, Stuttgart 2007.
- Hahn, A. and L., *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche (3rd edition)*, Breslau 1897.
- Hainthaler, Th., *Einige Überlegungen zum Titel 'Patriarch des Westens'*, in: Th. Hainthaler / F. Mali / G. Emmenegger (eds.), *Einheit und Katholizität der Kirche*, Innsbruck/Vienna 2009.
- Halleux, A. de, *"Hypostase" et "personne" dans la formation du dogme trinitaire (ca. 375-381)*, *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 79 (1984) 313-369. 625-670. (= ders., *Patrologie et Oecuménisme. Recueil d'études*, Louvain 1990, 113-214).
- Halleux, A. de, *La christologie de Martyrius-Sahdona dans l'évolution du nestorianisme*, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 23 (1957) 5-32.
- Halleux, A. de, *La définition christologique à Chalcédoine*, *Revue théologique de Louvain* 7 (1976) 3-23, 155-170 (= ders., *Patrologie et Oecuménisme. Recueil d'études*, Louvain 1990, 445-480).
- Halleux, A. de, *La philoxénienne du symbole (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 205)*, Rome 1978, 295-315.
- Halleux, A. de, *La première session du concile d'Ephèse (22 juin 431)*, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 69 (1993) 48-87.
- Halleux, A. de, *La vie mouvementée d'un 'hérétique' de l'église nestorienne*, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 24 (1958) 93-128.
- Halleux, A. de, *Le dyophysisme christologique de Cyrille d'Alexandrie*, H. C. Brennecke - E. L. Grasmück - C. Marksches (eds.), *Logos. FS Luise Abramowski*, Berlin 1993, 411-428.
- Halleux, A. de, *Les deux Rome dans la définition de Chalcédoine sur les prérogatives du siège de Constantinople*, *Mémoire Mgr. Maxime de Sardes (Geneva)* (= ders., *Patrologie et Oecuménisme. Recueil d'études*, Louvain 1990, 504-519).
- Halleux, A. de, *Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au concile d'Ephèse (430-433)*, *Revue théologique de Louvain* 23 (1992) 425-458.
- Halleux, A. de, *Nestorius: histoire et doctrine*, *Irénikon* 66 (1993) 38-51. 163-77.
- Halleux, A. de, *Philoxène de Mabbog. Sa vie, ses écrits, son théologie*, Louvain 1963.
- Halleux, A. de, *Un chapitre retrouvé du Livre de la perfection de Martyrius*, *Le Muséon* 88 (1975) 253-296.
- Harnack, A. von, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte II (4th ed.)*, Tübingen 1909.
- Hausherr, I., *Ignorance infinie ou science infinie*, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 25 (1959) 44-52 (= ders., *Hésychasme et prière [Orientalia Christiana Analecta 176]*, Rome 1966, 238-246).
- Hausherr, I., *Ignorance infinie*, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 2 (1936) 351-362 (= ders., *Hésychasme et prière [Orientalia Christiana Analecta 176]*, Rome 1966, 38-49).
- Hausherr, I., *Le "De oratione" d'Évagre le Pontique en syriaque et en arabe*, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 5 (1939) 7-71.
- Hausherr, I., *Le traité de l'oraison d'Évagre le Pontique (pseudo-Nil)*, *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 15 (1934) 34-94. 113-170.
- Hausherr, I., *Par delà l'oraison pure grâce à une coquille. A propos d'un texte d'Évagre*, *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 13 (1932) 184-188 (= ders., *Hésychasme et prière [Orientalia Christiana Analecta 176]*, Rome 1966, 8-12).

- Holl, K., *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Epiphanius* (Texte und Untersuchungen 36,2), Berlin 1910.
- Hübner, R., Gregory of Nyssa as the author of the so-called Ep. 38 of Basil, in: *Epektasis. Mélanges J. Danielou*, Paris 1972, 463-490.
- Hünemann, P., *Jesus Christ. God's Word in Time*, Münster 1994.
- Jammo, S. Y. H., *La structure de la messe chaldéenne du début jusqu'à l'anaphore. Étude historique* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 207), Rome 1979.
- Jansen, T., *Theodor von Mopsuestia, De incarnatione. Überlieferung und Christologie der griechischen und lateinischen Fragmente einschließlich Textausgabe* (PTS 65), Berlin 2009.
- Jedin, H. / Latourette, K. S. / Martin, J. (eds.), *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte*, Freiburg 1970.
- Jouassard, G., L'abandon du Christ en croix dans la tradition grecque des ^{IVe} et ^{Ve} siècles, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 5 (1925) 609-633.
- Kannengießer, C., Le mystère pascal du Christ selon Athanase d'Alexandrie, *Recherches de science religieuse* 63 (1975) 407-442.
- Kelly, J. N. D., *Altchristliche Glaubensbekenntnisse*, Göttingen 1972.
- Kerschesteiner, J., *Der altsyrische Paulustext* (CSCO 315, Subs. 37), Louvain 1970.
- Khalifé-Hachem, E., La prière pure et la prière spirituelle selon Isaac de Ninive, in: *Mémorial Mgr Gabriel Khouri-Sarkis*, Louvain 1969.
- Kinzig, W., *In search of Asterius. Studies on the Authorship of the Homilies on Psalms* (FKDG 47), Göttingen 1990.
- Labourt, J., *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide (224-632)*, Paris 1904.
- Lagarde, P. de, *Analecta Syriaca*, Leipzig 1858 (reprinted Osnabrück 1967).
- Lebon, J., Le moine saint Marcien. Étude critique des sources, édition de ses écrits. Éd. A. van Roy (*Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense* 36), Louvain 1968.
- Lebon, J., Les anciens symboles dans la définition de Chalcédoine, in: *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 32 (1936) 809-876.
- Liddell, H. G. / Scott, R. (eds.), *A Greek-English lexicon*, New (9th) edition, Oxford 1996.
- Liébaert, J., Art. Éphèse (Concile d'), 431, *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastique* 15 (1963) 561-574.
- Liébaert, J., Art. Ephesus, ecumenical synod (431), *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 9 (1982) 753-755.
- Liébaert, J., *La doctrine christologique de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle nestorienne*, Lille 1951.
- Loofs, Fr., *Nestoriana*, Halle 1905.
- Luisier, Ph., Michel Tardieu, *Recherches sur la formation de l'Apocalypse de Zostrien et les sources de Marius Victorinus*. Pierre Hadot, "Porphyre et Victorinus. Questions et hypothèses. Res Orientales IX, Groupe pour l'Étude de la civilisation du Moyen-Orient, Bures-sur-Yvette 1996, pp. 157, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 64 (1998) 211-213.
- Macina, R., L'homme à l'école de Dieu. D'Antioche à Nisibe: profil herméneutique, théologique et kérygmétique du mouvement scoliaste nestorien. Monographie programmatique, *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 32 (1982) 86-124. 263-301. 33 (1983) 39-103.
- Macomber, F. W., An Anaphoral Prayer composed by Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Parole de l'Orient* 6/7 (1975/1976) 341-347.
- Mahieu, L., L'abandon du Christ sur la croix, *Mélanges de science religieuse* 2 (1945) 207-242. Majercik, R., *The Chaldean Oracles. Text, translation and commentary*, Leiden 1989.
- Majercik, R., The Existence-Life-Intellect triad in gnosticism and Neoplatonism, *Classical Quarterly* 42 (1992) 475-488.
- Mansfeld, J., *Heresiography in Context. Hippolytus' Elenchos as a Source for Greek Philosophy*, Leiden 1992.

- Mansi, G. D. (ed.), *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Florence/Venice 1759-98.
- Margoliouth, P., *Supplement to the Thesaurus Syriacus* of R. Payne Smith, Oxford 1927 (reprint Hildesheim 1981).
- Martin, F., *Homelie de Narses sur les trois docteurs Nestoriens*, *Journal Asiatique* 9.15 (1900) 505-6.
- McCarthy, C., *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron* (Journ. Sem. Stud. Suppl. 2), Oxford 1993.
- McLeod, F. G., *The soteriology of Narsai* (dissertation Rome 1968).
- Mingana, A. (ed.), *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist* (WoodSt VI), Cambridge 1933.
- Mingana, A. (ed.), *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed* (WoodSt V), Cambridge 1932;
- Mingana, A. (ed.), *Narsai Doctoris Syri Homiliae et Carmina*, Mosul 1905.
- Moberg, A., *On some fragments of the book of Timotheos Ailuros against the Synod of Chalcedon*, Lund 1928.
- Moeller, Ch., *Le chalcédonisme et le neo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du ^{vi}e siècle*, in: A. Grillmeier / H. Bacht (eds.), *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart I*, Würzburg 1951, 637-720.
- Mooken, G. D., *A Re-examination of the Theology of Nestorius. With a view to assessing its relevance for today*, Jahalpur 1961 (unpublished Ph. D.-thesis).
- Moss, C., *Catalogue of Syriac printed books and related literature in the British Museum*, London 1962.
- Moutsoulas, E., *Τὸ προβλήματα τῆς χρονολογήσεως τῶν "Τριῶν κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν" λόγων τοῦ μεγάλου Ἀθανασίου*. *Θεολογία* 47 (1976) 542-557. 674-692.
- Mühlenberg, E., *Art. Ephesus, Councils. 1st Council of 431, Religion in History and Present*, 4th edition, vol. 2 (1999), 1349-1350.
- Müller, G., *Lexicon Athanasianum*, Berlin 1944-52 (reprint 2012).
- Muyldermans, J., *Euagria*. *Extrait de la revue le Muséon*, t. XLIV, augmenté de Nouveaux fragments grecs inédits, Paris 1931.
- Nau, F., *Nestorius, Le Livre d'Heraclide de Damas, avec le concours du R. P. Bedjan et de M. Brière*, Paris 1910.
- Oñatibia, S. I., *La vida christiana, tipo de las realidades celestes. Un concepto basico de la teologia de Teodoro de Mopsuestia*, *Scriptorium Victoriense I* (1954) 100-133.
- Opitz, H. G. (ed.), *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites 318-328* (Athanasius, Werke III 1), Berlin / Leipzig 1934.
- Ortiz de Urbina, I., *Patrologia syriaca*, Rome 1958.
- Pásztori-Kupán, I., *Theodoret of Cyrus*, London, New York, 2006.
- Payne Smith, J., *A compendious Syriac dictionary founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus* of R. Payne Smith, Oxford 1903 (reprint 1957 et al.).
- Payne Smith, R., *Thesaurus Syriacus*, Oxford 1879-1901 (reprint 1981 et al.).
- Pericoli-Ridolfini, F., *La controversia tra Cirill d'Alessandria e Giovanni di Antiochia nell'Epistolario di Andrea di Samosata*, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 28 (1953) 153-169.
- Pusey, Ph. E. (ed.), *S. P. N. Cyrilli, archiepiscopi alexandrini epistulae tres oecumenicae, libri quinque contra Nestorium, XII capitum explanatio, XII capitum defensio utraque, scholia de incarnatione unigeniti*, Oxford 1875.
- Reinink, G. J., *'Edessa grew dim and Nisibis shone forth': The School of Nisibis at the transition of the sixth-seventh century*, in: J. W. Drijvers / A. A. MacDonald (eds.), *Centres of learning*, Leiden etc. 1995, 77-89.
- Reinink, G. J., *Tradition and the Formation of the 'Nestorian' Identity in 6th-7th Century Iraq*, *Church History and Religious Culture* 89 (2009) 217-250.

- Reuß, J. (ed.), *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt* (Texte und Untersuchungen 61), Berlin 1957.
- Richard, M., *La tradition des fragments du traité Περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως de Théodore de Mopsueste*, *Le Muséon* 46 (1943), 55-75 (= ders., *Opera minora II*, Turnhout/Louvain 1977, no. 41).
- Richard, M., *L'introduction du mot "Hypostase" dans la théologie de l'incarnation*, *Mélanges de science religieuse*, 2 (1945), 5-32. 243-270.
- Richard, M., *Quelques nouveaux fragments des pères anténicéens et nicéens*, *Symbolae Osloenses* 38 (1963) 76-83.
- Richard, M., *Saint Basile et la mission du diacre Sabinus*, *Analecta Bollandiana* 67 (1949) 178-202 (= hes., *Opera Minora II*, Turnhout/Louvain 1977, no. 34).
- Ritter, A. M., *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol* (FKDG 15), Göttingen 1965.
- Rücker, A., *Ritus baptismi et missae, quem descripsit Theodorus ep. Mopsuestenus*, Münster 1933.
- Rucker, I., *Florilegium Edessenum anonymum* (Syriace ante 562), *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Abteilung*, 1933, H. 5, 39-44.
- Sachau, E., *Theodori Mopsuesteni fragmenta syriaca*, Leipzig 1869.
- Šagi-Bunić, T., *"Deus perfectus et homo perfectus" a concilio Ephesino (a. 431) ad Chalcedonense (a. 451)*, Romae 1965.
- Schäfer, K. Th., *Art. Diatessaron*, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2nd edition, vol. 3 (1959) 348-349.
- Schenke, H.-J., *Michel Tardieu, Recherches sur la formation de l'Apocalypse de Zostrien et les sources de Marius Victorinus / Pierre Hadot, "Porphyre et Victorinus". Questions et hypothèses = Res Orientales IX* (Bures-sur-Yvette, Groupe pour l'Étude de la Civilisation du Moyen-Orient 1996), 4°, 157 pp., in: *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 41 (1998), 252-256.
- Scher, A., *Ioseph Ḥazzaya, écrivain syriaque du VIII^e siècle*, *Rivista degli studi orientali* 3 (1910) 45-63.
- Schwaigert, W., *Miles and Papa: Der Kampf um den Primat. Ein Beitrag zur Diskussion um die Chronik von Arbela*, *V. Symposium Syriacum*, Louvain 1988 (*Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 236), Rome 1990, 393-402.
- Schwartz, E., *Aktenstücke zum Ephesinischen Konzil von 431*, Munich 1920.
- Schwartz, E., *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431, eine antichalkedonensische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos*, *Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse* 32.6, Munich 1927, 1-152.
- Schwartz, E., *Cyrrill und der Mönch Viktor*, Vienna 1928.
- Schwartz, E., *Konzilstudien*, Strasbourg 1914.
- Schwartz, E., *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma*, *Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse*, N. F. 10, 1934, vol. 10, 1-303.
- Schwartz, E.: *Der griechische Text der Kanones von Serdika*, *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 30 (1931) 1-35.
- Scipioni, L. I., *Ricerche sulla cristologia del 'Libro di Eraclide di Nestoria. La formulazione teologica e il suo contesto filosofico*, Fribourg 1956.
- Scipioni, L. I., *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso*, Milano 1974.
- Seibt, K., *Die Theologie des Markell von Ankyra* (*Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 59), Berlin et al. 1994 (reprint 2014).
- Sieber, John H., *Nag Hammadi Library in English*, Leiden 1988.
- Siegmund, G., *Art. Beseelung der Leibesfrucht*, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2nd edition, vol. 2 (1958) 294.
- Smith, A., *Porphyrian Studies since 1913*, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II* 36,2, Berlin/New York 1987, 719-773.

- Staats, R., Die römische Tradition im Symbol von 381 (NC) und seine Entstehung auf der Synode von Antiochien 379, *Vigiliae Christianae* 44 (1990), 209-221.
- Stead, C., Athanasius' earliest written work, *Journal of Theological Studies* N. S. 39 (1988) p. 76-91.
- Stead, C., The freedom of the will and the Arian Controversy in: H.-D. Blume/F. Mann (eds.), *Platonism and Christianity*. FS Heinrich Dörrie (Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Erg. Bd. 10), Münster 1983, 243-257 (= ders., *Substance and illusion in the Christian fathers*, *Collected Studies* 224, London 1985).
- Stead, Chr., Rez. Athanase d'Alexandrie évêque et écrivain. By Charles Kannengiesser. Pp. 416 (Théologie Historique, 70.) Paris: Beauchesne, 1983. N.p., *Journal of Theological Studies* 36 (1985) 220-229.
- Stülcken, A., *Athanasiana. Litterar- und dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Texte und Untersuchungen 19,4), Leipzig 1899.
- Sullivan, F. A., *The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Analecta Gregoriana 82 - Series Facultatis Theologiae Sct. B, n.29), Rome 1956.
- Swete, H. B., *Theodori episcopi Mopsuesteni in epistolas b. Pauli commentarii*, Cambridge 1880-1882.
- Tardieu, M., *Codex de Berlin* (Sources gnostiques et manichéennes 1), Paris 1984.
- Tardieu, M., *Recherches sur la formation de l'Apocalypse de Zostrien et les sources de Marius Victorinus* / Pierre Hadot, "Porphyre et Victorinus. Questions et hypothèses, Bures-sur-Yvette 1996.
- Tardieu, M., Une diatribe antignostique dans l'interpolation Eunomienne des *Recognitiones*, in: *ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΙΝΑ. Hellénisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie*. FS Claude Mondésert, Paris 1987, 325-337.
- Tetz, M., Ante omnia de sancta fide et de integritate veritatis. Questions of faith at the Synod of Serdica (342), *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 76 (1985) 243-269.
- Tetz, M., Art. Athanasius of Alexandria, *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 4 (1979) 333-349. Tetz, M., Über nikänische Orthodoxie. The so-called Tomus ad Antiochenos of Athanasius of Alexandria, *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 66 (1975) 194-222.
- Tetz, M., Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I-III, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 75 (1964) 217-270. 79 (1968) 3-42. 83 (1972) 145-194.
- Tommasi Moreschini, Ch. O.: *Viae negationis della dossologia divina nel medioplatonismo e nello gnosticismo tsethiano* (con echi in Mario Vittorino), in: Francesca Calabi (ed.) *Arrhetos theos. L'ineffabilità del primo principio nel medioplatonismo*, Pisa 2002, 110-150.
- Tommasi, Ch. O., *Tripotens in unalitate spiritus: Mario Vittorino e la gnosi*, *Koinonia* 20 (1996) 53-75.
- Tonneau, R. / Devreesse, R. (ed.), *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste* (Studi e Testi 145), Città del Vaticano 1949.
- Turner, J. D., *Victorinus, Parmenides Commentaries And The Platonizing Sethian Treatises*, in: K. Corrigan / J. Turner (eds.), *Platonisms: Ancient, Modern, and Postmodern*, Leiden 2007, 53-96.
- Ulrich, J., *Die Anfänge der abendländischen Rezeption des Nizänums* (Patristische Texte und Studien 39), Berlin/NewYork 1994.
- Valdivieso, P. Ortiz: *Un nuevo fragmento siríaco del Comentario de san Efrén al Diatésaron*, *Studia Papyrologica* 5 (1966) 7-17.
- Vogt, H.-J., Art. Ephesus. 3) Kirchengeschichte, 4) Konzil u. Synoden, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd edition, vol. 3 (1995) 706-707.
- Vogt, H.-J., Differences in the understanding of the Council between the Cyrillians and the Orientals at the Council of Ephesus 431, H. C. Brennecke - E. L. Grasmück - C. Marksches (eds.), *Logos*. FS Luise Abramowski, Berlin 1993, 429-451.

- Vries, W. de, Antiochien und Seleucia-Ctesiphon, Patriarch und Katholikos?, in: *Mélanges E. Tisserant III* (Studi e Testi 233), Città del Vaticano 1964, 429-450.
- Vries, W. de, Die syrisch-nestorianische Haltung zu Chalkedon, in: A. Grillmeier / H. Bacht (eds.), *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart I*, Würzburg 1951, 603-635.
- Waszink, J. H., Art. Beseelung, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 2 (1954), 176-183.
- Weis, H. G., Diodorus of Tarsus, *Περὶ πρόνοιας*, in: *Göttinger Arbeitskreis für syrische Kirchengeschichte* (ed.), *Paul de Lagarde und die syrische Kirchengeschichte*, Göttingen 1968, 217-230.
- Wensinck, A. J., *Mystic treatises by Isaac of Niniveh translated from Bedjan's Syriac text with an introduction and registers*, *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeeling Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks* 23,1, Amsterdam 1923.
- Westphal, G., *Untersuchungen über die Quellen und die Glaubwürdigkeit der Patriarchalchroniken des Mari ibn Sulaiman, 'Amr ibn Matai und Saliba ibn Johannan. Thèse de doctorat de Strasbourg* 1901.
- Williams, F. (transl.), *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Book I (Sects 1-46)*. (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 35), Leiden etc. 1987.
- Williams, F. (transl.), *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Books II and III (Sects 47-80, De Fide)*, (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 36), Leiden etc. 1994.
- Winkler, D. W., Die Christologie des ostsyrischen Katholikos Ṭshō'yaw III. von Adiabene (580-659), *Studia Patristica* 35 (2001) 516-526.
- Wolska, W., *La Topographie chrétienne du Cosmas Indicopleustès. Théologie et Science au ^{vi}e siècle*, Paris 1962.
- Wright, W., *A catalogue of the Syriac manuscripts preserved in the library of the University of Cambridge*, Cambridge 1901.
- Wright, W., *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, acquired since the year 1838*, London 1870.
- Wünsch, D., Art. Evangelienharmonie, *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 10 (1982) 626-636.

List of sources

ACTA CONCILII SELEUCENSIS A. 410	232-233	ACTA CONCILII PRAESIDE MAR ABA A. 544	
- can. 1	233	— ep. I s. Synodicon Orientale	p. 69-80/
- can. 6	232-233, 247	320-332	
- can. 12	232, 247	— ep. II s. Synodicon Orientale	p. 540-543/
- can. 15	269	550-553	
- can. 18	233	— ep. III s. Synodicon Orientale	p. 80-85/
- can. 21	233, 261	332-338	
		— ep. IV s. Synodicon Orientale	p. 85-89/
ACTA CONCILII EPHESENI A. 431	6, 15, 352	338-345	
- ACO I,1,1, p. 114-116	466	— ep. V s. Synodicon Orientale	p. 89-95/345-351
- ACO I,1,2, p. 12-13	467	— ep. VI s. Synodicon Orientale	p. 543-545/
- ACO I,1,2, p. 13-31	467	553-555	
- ACO I,1,2, p. 31-35	467	Canones s. Synodicon Orientale	p. 545-550/
- ACO I,1,2, p. 35-37	467	555-561	
- ACO I,1,2, p. 54	468	— can. XIII	255
- ACO I,1,3, p. 6-7	467	— can. XIX	255
- ACO I,1,3, p. 24-26	468	— can. 37 arabice	255
- ACO I,1,3, p. 26-28	469	— can. XXXIX	255
- ACO I,1,3, p. 31-32	469		
- ACO I,1,4, p. 3-4	470	ACTA CONCILII CONSTANTINOPOLITANIS A. 553	8
- ACO I,1,4, p. 8-9	470	— ACO IV,1 p. 52,1-3	132
- ACO I,1,4, p. 15-20	470	— ACO IV,1 p. 53,18-27	193
- ACO I,1,5, p. 119-120	466	— ACO IV 1 p. 55.6-10	40
- ACO I,1,5, p. 122-123	468	— ACO IV,1 p. 60,1-475	, 85
- ACO I,1,7, p. 30	470	— ACO IV,1 p. 60,8-1272	, 85
- ACO I,1,7, p. 67-68	469	— ACO IV,1 p. 62,3-5	69
- ACO I,1,7, p. 70	470	— ACO IV,1, p. 70-72	407-408
- ACO I,1,7, p. 73-83	468	— ACO IV,1 p. 70 app. crit.	70-71
- ACO I,1,7, p. 84-95	468	— ACO IV,1 p. 71,18-25	70
- ACO I,1,7, p. 97-100	468	— ACO IV,1 p. 71,31-35	71
- ACO I,1,7, p. 98-99	70, 85	— ACO IV,1 p. 72,10-12	72
- ACO I,1,7, p. 9971	, 85	— ACO IV,1 p. 81,2-8	74, 95
- ACO I,1,7, p. 142	469	— ACO IV 1, p. 105 f.	407
- ACO I,1,7, p. 146	470	— ACO IV,1 p. 180,1-566	, 85, 281
- ACO I,1,7, p. 149	470	— ACO IV,1 p. 249,19-22	112
- ACO I,4, p. 74	469	— ACO IV,2 p. 72,1-5	75
- ACO I,4, p. 85	469		
		ALEXANDER OF ALEXANDRIA	
ACTA CONCILII CHALCEDONENSIS A. 451		— Deed 4b	325
- ACO II,1 p. 78,26	237	— Deed 14	326
- ACO II,1 p. 289-290	351		
- can. 28	243	AMBROSE OF Milan	
see also Subject index, Creed, Chalcedonense		De fide I,3,24	132
		In Lucam VIII,49-51	475
		APOPTHEGMATA PATRUM	293

ARISTOTLE		- 3,23	321, 401-402
De generatione animalium	105	- 3,24	402
		- 3,26-58	308, 325, 329
ARIUS		- 3,26	325-330
Thalia	308, 329	- 3,27	326
Deed 6	383, 455	- 3,30-33	310
		- 3.32 ff.	309
ASTERIUS		- 3,36	322
- frg. I-IIa Bardy	330	- 3,56-57	186
- frg. XI Bardy	313	- 3,58	311
- frg. 14 Bardy	313	- 3,59-67	308, 310-313
		- 3,59	307, 312
ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA		- 3,60	308, 312, 323
De decretis 26	319	- 3,61	312
De incarnatione	309	- 3,65	320-321
Epistula ad Epictetum	470	- 3,66	320-321
Epistula festalis XLIX a. 367	495	- 3,67	307, 309
Orationes contra Arianos		- 3,68	320
1-2	307-309, 325, 328-330	De sententia Dionysii	
- 1,32	329	- 15,1	323
- 1,46-47	133	De synodis	
- 2,37	328-329	- 18	330
- 2,43	311	- 25	310
- 2,51	309	- 26	310-311
- 2,53	309	Tomus ad Antiochenos	309, 319, 345, 412
- 2,62-64	309	- 3	7
- 2,62	339	- 7	7
3	307-330	Vita Antonii	489
- 3,1-25	308, 313-315		
- 3,1-6	314	Ps.Athanasius s. Markell	
- 3,1-16	308		
- 3,1	320	AUGUSTINE	
- 3,2	308, 312	Confessiones	
- 3,3-6	323	VII,9,13	453
- 3,3	321-323	VIII,2	452
- 3,4	320-322	Contra Academicos	452
- 3,5	324	De beata vita	452
- 3,6	322-323	De civitate dei	
- 3,7-16	314	10,23	403
- 3,9	309	10,29	415
- 3,10	313-314	De haeresibus	10
- 3,16	320, 324	De ordine	
- 3,17-25	400	I,10,29	453
- 3,17	400-401	II,5,16	451-453
- 3,18-22	403	II,5,51	449
- 3,19	401		
- 3,20	320	BABAI THE GREAT	
- 3,21	401	Commentarius in Evagrium	89, 195, 200, 203,
- 3,22-25	314	206	
- 3,22	321-322	- prol.	98

– in V,55	203	– 74,1-3	405-406
– in suppl. 29-30	201, 205	– 74,4	406
Rules for the novices	295	– 75	406
De unione	89-150, 366, 374	– 76	406-412
– I,	1102,	– 77	408, 412-413
139		– 78	408, 413
– I,	2139,	– 79	405, 413
150		– 80	405
– I,3	126, 150	– 82-83	405
– I,5	128, 150, 294	– 107,5	405
– II,6	150		
– II,7	102, 149	COLLECTIO AVELLANA	
– II,8103	, 126, 132-133, 136, 149	– ep. 40	238
– III,998	, 100, 116-117, 123, 149	– ep. 64	239
– III,10 99, 102, 105-108, 111-112, 114-117, 122,		– ep. 69	238
131, 144, 149		– ep. 79	238
– III,11102	, 122, 125, 133	– ep. 80	238
– IV,1297	, 100, 102, 131, 134-135	– ep. 83s. Vigilius of Rome, Constitutum	
– IV,15	131, 135-139	– ep. 95	238, 243
– IV,16	122-123		
– IV,17 100, 117-118, 120-124, 126-127, 149-150		COLLECTIO CASINENSIS	
– V,18102	, 123	– ACO I,4, p. 74	469
– V,19	105, 111, 113-117	– ACO I,4, p. 85	469
– VI,	20100, 122-123, 128, 141, 148-		
149		COLLECTIO SEGUIERANA	
– VI,21	97, 102, 126-128, 135, 139-149	– ACO I,1,3, p. 31-32	469
– VII	97-98, 103-104, 128, 149		
Tractatus Vaticanus	89, 102-103, 105, 109,	COLLECTIO SICHARDIANA	
119-121, 123-130, 149		– ACO I,5, p. 314 f.	407
Vita of the martyr George	34, 89		
		COLLECTIO VATICANA	
BAR BAHLUL		s. Acta concilii Epheseni a. 431	
Lexicon	170		
		Concilium s. Acta	
BAR Sarošway		CONCILIIUM CONSTANTINOPOLITANUM A. 381	
Lexicon	172	– can. 3	243
BASIL OF CAESAREA De spiritu sancto		CORPUS HERMETICUM	473
– 29,72	319		
Epistulae		DADISHO QATRAYA	
– 263,5	339	Commentary on the Book of Isaiah of Gaza	
		– I-VI	293
		– I,17	299
Rule of BENEDICT	295	– I,20	299
		– I,36	299-300
Chronicle OF ARBELA	268	– I,37	300
		– VI,4	296
CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA		– VII-XIII	293
Excerpta ex Theodoto	475	– VII,3	299
		– VII.7	300
COLLECTIO ATHENIENSIS			
– 73-79	405		
– 73	405		

– VII,11	300	EPIPHANIUS OF SALAMIS	
– VII,14	300-301	Anakephalaiosis	3, 6, 10-21
- VIII,3	297	- prooem.	12
- X,2	298	- 2,2	20
- XI,2	298, 301	- 3,1	16, 20
- XI,7	298	- 3,2	17, 20
- XI,17	301, 304	- 3,6	20
- XII	295	- 3,7	17, 20
- XIII,2	294	- 3,9	16
- XIII,4 f.	296, 298	- 7,1	11
- XIII,5	297	- 12,9	11
- XIII,6	294, 297	- 13,2	11
- XIV	301	- 15,2	16
- XIV,5	301	- 16	16
- XV	301	- 21,3	17
- XV,12-15	301	- 34,1-2	17
- XV,16	303	- 35	16
- XV,18	302	- 42,2	18
		- 45,2	16
DAMASUS OF ROME		- 49-50	13
Tomus Damasi	333, 346, 348, 390	- 56	18
Anathematisms		- 57,1	18
- 2nd series	348-349	- 60	18
"Letters" of Damasus		- 61	18
- No. 1 (Confidimus)	341-343	- 65	18
- No. 2-4	342	- 66,1	18
- No. 2 (Ea gratia)	343	- 70	18
cf. no. 5 of the collection (eastern subscription)		- 74	16
341-344		- 75	13
		- 76	20
DIATESSARONE	178	Panarion omnium haeresium	11-14
- Liège Diatessaron	182	- prooemium 1.3	11
		- prooemium 1,3-4	12
DIODORUS OF TARSUS		- prooemium 1,1-3,5	12
- frg. 18	191, 194	- prooemium 3.1	11
- De providentia	203	- 14,2,2	16
		– 20 Christianity 1,1	11-12
DIONYSIUS BAR-SALIBI		– 20 Christianity 1:1-4:9	12
Commentarius in Lucam		- 21,1,3-22	12
- p. 248,17-29	105	- 26,2	491
		- 26,10	454
EPHRAEM		- 26,16	491
Commentarius in Diatessaron	178-179	- 26,17	456-457
- I,10	180	- 39,1	488-489
- I,25	180	- 40,1	488-490
- X,15	180	- 48,14,4	14
- XX,30181	, 187	- 49.tit.	13
- XXI,	1178-181, 183, 187	- 60,1,1-2	17-18
- XXI,2-3	183	- 62,1,2-2,1	13
- XXII,3	180	- 69,63,1-68,6	182

- 70,2,4	13	GNOSTICA	
- 75,3,6-9	13	Allogenes	432, 436, 450, 483-486, 488, 492,
- 77,23,3	13	496	
- 77,36,5	13	— p. 45-57	484
		— p. 47	484
EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA		— p. 49	484
Historia ecclesiastica	32	— p. 53-54	492
Praeparatio evangelica		— p. 57-69	484
XI,13-20	416	— p. 58	484-485
XI,19,1	414, 479	— p. 59	485
XI,20,1	416	— p. 60	485
XI,20,3	416	— p. 61-67	486
		— p. 61-62	486
EUSEBIUS OF DORYLÄUM		— p. 61	485
Obtestatio (ACO I,1,1)	355-356	— p. 62-63	484, 486
		— p. 65-69	485
EUSEBIUS OF NICOMEDIA		— p. 67	485
Deed 8	383	Anonymus Brucianus	450, 492
		— p. 51	492
EVACRIUS PONTICUS		Apocryphon Iohannis	432, 442, 450, 482-483,
Kephalai Gnostica, 6 centuria	197, 206	486, 494	
— I,67	113	BG 2	
— I,88	203	— p. 22	482
— II,3	203	— p. 24-25	484
— II,51	113	— p. 26	482
— III,88	206	— p. 27-28	483
— Vulgate version (p) ₁	89	— p. 27	482
Supplement	198	NH II,1	
— c. 2-4	197	— p.4-5	483
— c. 4	205	— p. 4	482
— c. 25	205	Three steles of Seth	436, 441, 450, 483
— c. 29	197, 200-202	Eugnostos	454-455
— c. 30	195-207	— § 3	454
De oratione		— § 8	454
— c. 3	198	Marsanes	450, 483
— c. 47	198	— p. 5-6	484
— c. 52	198-199	— p. 5	483
— c. 65	201	— p. 31-32	492
— c. 70	198	Pistis Sophia	450
		Protennoia trimorphos	433-434, 450
EVACRIUS SCHOLASTICUS		Sophia Iesu Christi	455
Historia ecclesiastica		Understanding our great power	
— I,7	119	— p. 40,7	495
		Zostrianus	414, 418-420,
FACUNDUS OF HERMIANE		432-436, 441-442, 444, 448, 450, 456,	
Ad Iustinianum IX,4,44	281	459, 472, 475-483, 486, 492, 496	
		— p.8	492
FLORILECIUM EDESSENUM	3, 7-8	— p. 12-13	492
		— p. 12	492
		— p. 13	485

- p. 14	486-487	I,29	482-483, 491
- p. 15	486-487	II,15,3	493
- p. 64-69	421		
- p. 64-67	420	ISAAC OF NINEVEH	
- p. 64-66	421, 431, 472	De perfectione religiosa	209-210
- 64-65	432	— p. 170.2 ff.	204
- p. 64	421	— p. 173-175	204
- p. 65-66	433-434	— p. 260.4 f.	204
- p. 65	421	— p. 304	203
- p. 66-84	435	— p. 508	202-203
- p. 66-75	431	Tracts	
- p. 66	419, 421, 439, 472	— 19	202
- p. 67	421, 439, 472		
- p. 68	421	ISAIAH OF GAZA	
- p. 74	421, 472	Book/Asketikon	293-304
- p. 75	421, 472		
- p. 78	420, 444, 481	ISO' YAHB III.	
- p. 79	445, 481	Epistulae	
- p. 84	421, 472	— II,7	214, 218
- p. 127	492	— II,30	209
GRECOR OF NAZIANZUS		JOHANNES CASSIANUS	
or. 27-31	351	De incarnatione domini contra Nestorium	355
		— VI,3.5.6	357
GRECOR OF NYSSA		JOHN CHRYSOSTOM	
Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dei	380	Orationes catecheticae	
GRECOR THAUMATURCUS		— I,19-23	353-354
Ad Theopompum	3, 10	— I,24	353
		— VIII	353
PS.-HIERONYMUS		JOHN OF DALYATHA	
— Commentarius in Iob	113	— Ep. 12,3	206
— Indiculus de haeresibus	450		
HISTORIA LAUSIACA 293		JUSTINIAN I.	
		Epistula ad Menam	
HISTORIA MONACHORUM IN AEGYPTO	293	— 1. anathematism	108
		— 5. anathematism	112
IAMBlichus		KOSMAS INDIKOPLEUSTES	
De mysteriis (Responsum)	484	Topographia Christiana	90
		II,	2231, 252
IRENAEUS OF LYON		CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA	
Adversus haereses		Anathematismata XII	6, 15, 92, 221, 466-468,
I,1	463	470	
I,2	429, 463-464		
I,3	463-464		
I,4	429	— 3. anathematism	222
I,5	459	— 9. anathematism	131
I,11,3	432, 459	Apologia XII capitulorum contra Orientales (ACO I,1,7, no. 24)	3, 11

- 50	131	LEONTIUS OF JERUSALEM	
- 59-60	131	Contra monophysitis	94-95
- 87	131	- I	95
- 90	131	Contra Nestorianos	
- 96	131	- II,14	119
Apologia XII anathematismorum contra Theodoretum		- II,16	119
		- II,34	119
(ACO I,1,6, no. 167-169)	3, 11		
- 28	131	MARIUS VICTORINUS	
- 36	131	Candidi Epistula I	
- 39	131	11,17	461
- 50	131	Ad Candidum	
- 73-74	131	7,1	476
Commentarius in Matthaeum	185	7,2-7	435, 476-477
- frg. ex Severo	187-188, 192	18,5	424
- frg. ex catena no. 312	188-189	Adversus Arium	
Epistula ad Iohannem s. Acta concilii Const.		I,13	461, 464
a. 553 ACO IV,1, p.	105 f.	I,16	425, 443, 449
Epistula II ad Nestorium	467	I,17	425-426
Epistula III ad Nestorium	466	I,22	425-426, 428-429, 431
De recta fide ad Augustas	185	I,24	425-426, 461-462
- 17 (olim 18)	190	I,25	462
Quod unus sit Christus	185, 188, 191	I,28	425
- 733C	141	I,30	476
- 756D-759A	192-193	I,32	425-426
Thesaurus de sancta et consubstantiali trinitate		I,37	461-463
185, 189		I,40	425-427
- 24 (397D-400A)	185-186	I,44	425, 427, 429-431
		I,45	425, 429-430
Ps CYRIL		I,47	422-424, 431, 463
De incarnatione		I,49-50	420-421, 472, 477, 479, 481
- 30	217	I,49	431-437, 475, 477-478
		I,50	431, 435-442, 445-447, 449, 478-480
LEO OF ROME		I,51	428, 429
Sermo de passione	187, 471	I,52	443, 449
Tomus Leonis ad Flavianum	7, 28, 92, 104, 143-144, 149, 292	I,53	473, 475
		I,54	473
		I,55	476
LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM		I,56-57	473
Excerpta ex Theodoro et aliis haereticis		I,56	449, 451, 473
- frg. 2	52-53, 85	I,58	473
- frg. 3	54, 85	I,59	474
- frg.	455, 85	I,60	473-475, 478
- frg. 6	60-61, 79-80, 85, 94, 364	I,61	442
- frg. 7	60-61, 81-82, 85, 94, 364	I,62	473-475
- frg. 14	69, 85	I,64	477
- frg. 15	101	III,6	476
- frg. 16	101	III,7	448, 450
- frg. 21	84-85	IV,3	476
		IV,4	476

IV,5	476	PS. NARSAI	
IV,8	464	hom. 35/17 (Expositio mysteriorum = hom. A)	153-
IV,11	425	164	
IV,21	436-437, 442, 449		
IV,24	439, 478-479	NESTORIUS	
IV,29	461-464	Liber Heraclidis	33, 35, 89-93, 149, 213-215,
IV,30	464	219, 364-366, 368, 372-374	
IV,31	425, 427-429, 460	— II,1 p. 425 Bedjan	121
IV,32	428	— II,1 p. 439-442 Bedjan	121
		— II,2 p. 466 Bedjan	149
MARKELL FROM ANKYRA		— II,2 p. 471 Bedjan	120
Expositio fidei	143	— II,2 p. 472-473 Bedjan	149
De incarnatione et contra Arianos	357	— II,2 p. 495 Bedjan	120
		— II,2 p. 519 Bedjan	149
MARTYRIUS SAHDONA		Sermo V	104
De perfectione		Sermo IX	146
- II,2 de fide	208-218	Sermo X	104, 133
- II,2 § 4	217	Sermo XVIII	104
- II,2 § 20-21	217	Ad Alexandrum Hieropolitanum	146
- II,2 § 23	217		
- II,2 § 25	217	PS. NESTORIUS	
- II,2 § 28	217	Liber Heraclidis, Dialogus	33, 90,
- II,2 § 30-32	217	93, 149, 179, 208, 213-215, 219, 288-292,	
- II,3 § 12	217	363-366, 368, 372-374	
		— I,1, p. 10-14 Bedjan	288-289
METHODIUS OF OLYMPUS		— I,1, p. 14-63 Bedjan	289
De resurrectione	8	— I,1, p. 19-21 Bedjan	291
		— I,1, p. 24-27 Bedjan	290
MICHAEL MALPANA		— I,1, p. 25 Bedjan	289
Book of Definitions and Subdivisions	166-174	— I,1, p. 63-76 Bedjan	289
Man as a microcosm	172-174	— I,1, p. 81 Bedjan	364
Quaestions	172	— I,1, p. 125 Bedjan	117-119
Scripture of dreams	168, 174	Kephalaia in Cambridge Or. 1319	
		— 1 281-285	
NARSAI		— 2 285	
- hom. 4	224	— 3 283-286	
- hom. 11	221	— 8 286	
- hom. 26175-178	, 184-185	— 9 285	
- hom. 36	224	— 10 286	
- hom. 38/21 (= hom. C)	153, 155	— 12 286	
- hom. 39/22 (= hom. B)	153, 155	— 14 285	
- hom. 45	224	— 17-18	281
- hom. 59/32 (= hom. D)	153	— 28 281	
- hom. 79	224		
— Homily on 3 Nestorian teachers	373	NILUS OF ANKYRA	
— Homelias for the Nativity, Epiphany and Easter		De oratione s. Evagrius	
	373		
		NUMENIUS	
		frg. 11	442

OLYMPIODOR		PLOTINUS	
Commentarius in Alcibiadem p. 16	112	Enneads	
		— II,8,10	427
ORACULA CHALDAICA	440, 446, 448-449	— II,9,1	444, 481, 492
— frg. 4	403	— II,9,3	429
— frg. 31	403	— II,9,6	492
— frg. 37	427		
ORICENES		PORPHYRIUS	
Contra Celsum 8,12	314	Commentarius in Oracula Chaldaica	446, 451
In Matthaeum Comm. Ser. 57-58	475	Vita Plotini	
De oratione 31.3	113	16	414, 419, 488
		cf. also Turin Commentary	
PAPA KATHOLIKOS SELEUCENSIS		PROCLUS (NEO-PLATONIST)	
ep. I-VIII	272	Elementa Theologica	112
ep. I-IV	272	— prop. 47-48	128
ep. V-VIII	272	— prop. 86	128
ep. V	273, 275	— prop. 102	127
ep. VI	273		
ep. VII	272	PROCLUS OF ALEXANDRIA	
ep. VIII	271-276	Tomus ad Armenios	8
PHILASTRIUS OF BRESCIA		PSEUDO-CLEMENTINES	
Diversarum haereseon liber 75	14	Prologue of the Rufin	453
		Recognitiones III2-11	453
PHILOSTORCIUS		RABBULA OF EDESSA	
Historia ecclesiastica		Epistula ad Cyrillum	8
III,15	456		
PHILOXENUS OF MABBUC		SOLOMON OF BOSRA	
Commentarius in Iohannem		Book of the Bee 57	173-174
prol.	144, 289		
Tractatus tres de trinitate et incarnatione ("Book of Sentences")	97, 108, 290	SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH Contra impium grammaticum	
III,3	98	II,37	146
Book against Habib	290	III,1,6	187
Letter to the monks of Senun	291-292	III 15	55
		Philaethes	146
PHOTIUS		p. 156,7-11	55
Bibliotheca			
— cod. 4	282	SYNODICON ORIENTALE	34, 89, 144, 220, 234,
— cod. 177	282	373-374	
		— p. 17/253	229
PLATO		— p. 17 f./253 f.	232
Parmenides	432-433	— p. 18/254	231
Phaidros	433	— p. 18/255 f.	232, 234
Sophistes	432	— p. 19 f./256 f.	231
Timaeus		— p. 20/259	231
41a-42b	484	— p. 25/264 f.	235, 247
		— p. 27/266	247

- p. 35/274	231	THEODOR BAR KONI	
- p. 38/277	235	Liber scholiorum	
- p. 42/283	231	- II,7-8	111
- p. 43-53/285-299	260-269	- IX,3	34-35, 79-83, 85
- p. 43/285	235, 262	- IX,4	82, 211
- p.43-44/286-287	257, 262	- X	35
- p. 44-46/287-289	263	- Urmiah review	83
- p. 45/288	235		
- p. 46-50/289-294	263	THEODOR OF MOPSUESTIA	
- p. 46/289 f.	230, 261	Contra Apolinarium	283
- p. 47-48/291-292	263	Contra Eunomium	221, 281-287
- p. 48/291	258	Contra magos (Mastubya)	303
- p. 48-49/292-293	230, 257, 264	Historia religiosa	303
- p. 49-50/293-294	258, 264	Homiliae catecheticae 24-25, 155, 158-159, 164,	
- p. 50-51/294-295	265	299-300, 337, 355-357, 359, 367	
- p. 51-52/295-297	266	- 1-9	361
- p. 52-53/297-298	231,267-268	- 1-8	348
- p. 59/306	231	- 2	338
- p. 61/308 f.	235	- 2,5	338
- p. 63/311	240, 247	- 3	338
- p. 64/313	240-242, 247	- 3,5	25, 76-77, 85
- p. 65/314 f.	231, 242	- 3,6	338
- p. 68 f./318 f.	232, 246	- 5-8	286
- p. 69/319	245	- 6,3	350
- p. 69-80/320-332	247	- 7,11	358
- p. 69-73/320-324	248-249	- 7,15	286
- p. 70/321	248	- 9,1336-337, 340, 343, 346-347	
- p. 73-80/324-332	247-248	- 9,14	336, 338, 345, 347
- p. 74-77/326-328	249-250	- 9,15	346
- p. 80-85/332-338	250	- 9,16	346
- p. 85-89/338-345	250-252	- 10,2-3	348
- p. 89-95/345-351	252-254	- 10,3-7	359-360
- p. 91-92/347-348	253	- 10,13-14	349
- p. 95/352	269	- 10,14-15	359
- p. 108/366	231	- 10,19	359
- p. 133-136	160	- 10,21	359
- p. 159-160/419-420	256	- 13,8	100
- p. 227/490	227	In Acta apostolorum	202
- p. 525/531	235	In epistolas ad Corinthios	164, 302
- p. 525-531/531-539	236-237, 248	In epistolam ad Hebraeos (ex catena; Staab)	
- p. 531/539	235	- ad Heb 2,9-10	69
- p. 540-542/550-553	254	In Genesim	202
- p. 543-545/553-555	254-255	In Iob	202
- p. 545-550/555-561	255	In Iohannem	24-25, 300
- p. 623-625	240	- p.34,18 f.	28
		In Matthaeum	164, 202, 299
TERTULLIAN		In Lucam	302
Adversus Praxean	367, 444	In XII prophetas	202
- 8,1-3	443	In Psalmos	301
		- in Ps 44:8	132

De incarnatione fragmenta Syriaca (Bl add.		THEODORET OF CYRUS	
12156)	1-85, 165, 211-212, 215, 221	Epistulae	
– frg. 1	40	– ep. 151	217
– frg. 2 8	41-48	Eranistes	92
– frg. 9	28, 49-50	Historia ecclesiastica	
– frg. 10	51	– I,4	326
– frg. 11	52	– II,8,38	315-316
– frg. 12	53	– II,8,39-40	316
– frg. 13	54	– II,8,39	318
– frg. 14	55	– II,8,44	317
– frg. 15	56	– II,8,45	314
– frg. 16/16'	30, 32, 34-35, 38, 57-61, 65,	– II,8,48	317
79-83, 364		– II,8,50-52	399-400
– frg. 17-18	62-63	– V,9,11-12	331-332, 335-336, 338, 388-389
– frg. 19/19'	33, 38, 64-65	– V,9,15	345
– frg. 20/20'	38, 64, 66-67	– V,11	343
– frg. 21-22	68		
– frg. 23-24	69	TIMOTHY AELURUS	
– frg. 25a/b	70-71	De conversione dyophysitarum	3
– frg. 26-29	72-73	Epistulae	3
– frg. 30	74	Narratio Timothei	3
– frg. 31	75	Solutio definitionis Chalcedonensis	3
– frg. 32	76-77	Solutio tomi Leonis	3
– frg. 33	78		
De incarnatione fragmenta Graeca et Latina		TURIN COMMENTARY ON PARMENIDES 440-441,	
(Jansen)		446-448, 472, 494-496	
– frg. I	40, 85	IV,7 f.	447
– frg. VII	52-53, 85	V,21 f.	447
– frg. VIII	54, 85	IX,4	446
– frg. IX55	, 85	XIII,19 f.	447
– frg. XII	60-61, 79-80, 85, 94, 364		
– frg. XIII	60-61, 81-82, 85, 94, 364	VICILIUS OF ROME Constitutum	
– frg. XIX-XXI	85	(Coll. Avell. 83)	
– frg. XXII	66, 85, 281	– 1	284
– frg. XXIV	69, 85	– 9	283
– frg. XXV101	, 283	– 26	40
– frg. XXVI101	, 283	– 39	75
– frg. XXXIII	84-85	– 40	72
– frg. XLI132	, 146	– 48	283
De perfectione observantiae	299	Constitutum II (ACO IV,2, 138-168)	344
Pearl book	303		
De spiritu sancto	302	ZACHARIAS RHETOR	
		Church history	
THEODORUS ANACOSTES		– V,10	238-239
Epitome § 501	158		

Bible

passages

Gen 1	224	Mt 24:39-41	474
Gen 1:1	381	Mt 26,26	165
Gen 1:26	107, 464	Mt 26,39	327
Gen 1:28	114	Mt 26,41	328
Gen 2	224	Mt 26,67	123
Gen 2:7	107, 473-474	Mt 27,30	35
Gen 8:21	188	Mt 27:46175-177	, 181-193, 328
		Mt 27,50	181
Ex 7	289	Mt 28,18-20	338, 349
Ex 10.14.9.3	290	Mt 28,18	327
Ex 13:2	463		
Ex 25 ff.	234	Mark 6:38	327
Ex 28,29 f.	234	Mark 15:33f	428
Ex 33:20	123	Mark 16:19	143
Lev 12:2-4, 6-8	106	Luke 1:31	26, 76, 101
Deut 32:39	314-315	Luke 1, 32	26, 76
		Luke 1:35108	, 131, 134, 180, 473
Ps 21	193	Luke 2:11132	, 134
Ps 44:8	132, 134	Luke 2:23	463
		Luke 2:52	327
Prov. 8	382-383	Luke 4:1	139
Prov 8:22-31	382	Luke 4:22	99
Prov 8,22	310	Luke 9:51	143
Prov 8.30	420	Luke 10:22	327
		Luke 15:12 f.	474
Eccl 3,27-30	299	Luke 17:34 f.	475
Sap 7.26	320, 443	Luke 22:20	424
		Luke 23:43	175
Hos 1:9	188	Lk23,46175	, 177-178, 181
Joel 2:25	330		
Isa 40,15.18	190	John	1414-415, 479
Bar 3:36-38	357	John 1:1-8	453
		John 1:	1222, 379, 417, 420
Mt 1,1	73	John 1:3	417
Mt 1:13-16	73	John 1:4	417
Mt 1,20	131-132	John 1:	146, 15, 28, 32, 97, 101, 148, 223, 290,
Mt 1,21	100		359, 379, 452, 473
Mt 3,11	72	John 1:18	443
Mt 3,15	136	John 1:32 f.	224
Mt 3,17	72	John 2:19	418
Mt 5,8	299-300	John 2:21393	, 418
Mt 10,28	36	John 4:13	402
Mt 12,28	45	John 5:22	327
Mt 13,32	328	John 5:35 f.	327
Mt 16,13	327	John 6:37	322
Mt 19,6	57	John 10	399

John 10:30	314-315, 322	1 Cor 15	113-114, 116, 333
John 11:34	327	1 Cor 15:21	48
John 12:27 f.	327	1 Cor 15:24-29	380
John 12:28	327	1 Cor 15:42-44	114
John 13:21	327	1 Cor 15:47	28
John 14	399	1 Cor 15:51-52	114
John 14:10	314, 322-324	1 Cor 15:53	114
John 14:15	300, 359	2 Cor 2:15	430
John 14:16	359	2 Cor 3:13	300
John 14:17	359-360	2 Cor 3:18	300
John 14:21,23	300	2 Cor 4:16	59
John 14:28	314	Gal 4:4	78, 97
John 15:26	360	Eph 1:10	463
John 16:5	402	Phil 2	136, 143, 212, 354, 427, 429
John 16:14	45	Phil 2:6	324, 379, 440, 473
John 17	399	Phil 2:7	125, 143
John 17:5	328	Phil 2:8-11	96
John 17:6	64	Phil 2:8 f.	137
John 17:10	314	Phil 2:9	143
John 17:11	315, 400, 403	Col 1:15-20	461-462
John 17:20-23	314-315, 400	Col 1:15	161, 163, 338-339, 355, 361, 416
John 17:21	314-315, 399, 401, 403	Col 1:20	462
John 17:22	403	Col 2:9	461-463
John 17:23	322	Col 3:11	463
John 18:3-6	19	Col 3:14	401-402
Acts 1:2, 11, 22	143	1 Tim 2:5 f.	217
Acts 2:36	132, 134	1 Tim 3:16	44, 76-77, 103, 136, 143
Acts 4:8	139	Titus 2:13	217, 286
Acts 4:11	285		
Acts 5:12-13	285	Heb 1:3	161, 163, 320,323, 342, 362, 443
Acts 7:12	285	Heb 1:6	74
Acts 10:38	71, 76-77, 132, 134	Heb 2:9-10	69, 77
Acts 12:10	285	Heb 2:10	136
Acts 13:9	139	Heb 2:16	104
Acts 19:1	285	Heb 4:15	108, 137
		Heb 5:8 f.	136-137
Rom 1:3	73	Heb 9:14	76
Rom 1:4	73	Heb 10:7	355
Rom 1:20	329	Heb 13:8	103-104
Rom 5:12	41		
Rom 5:15	41	1 Peter 2:22	188, 192
Rom 5:18 f.	136		
Rom 9:5	217	1 John 2:22	379
Rom 11:36	463	1 John 4:2	379
1 Cor 1:24	329	1 John 4:3	379
1 Cor 2:6	51	1 John 4:14	379
1 Cor 6:17	135, 141	1 John 5:1	379
1 Cor 11:1	32	1 John 5:5	379
1 Cor 12	111	2 John 7	379

Names

(persons and

places) Aaron 234,

289

Abdisho' of Elam 154, 260, 299, 302

Abdisho' of Saliba 275

Abraham 136, 190

Abraham of Beit-Lapat 247, 249-250

Abraham of Kaškar 90, 374

Abramowski, Rudolf 26, 28, 31, 43, 53, 62,
75-77, 191

Abu'l-Farradj 181

Abzud s. Badoqa Bazud

Acacius of Amid 260, 264

Acacius of Beroea 405

Acacius of Constantinople 239, 292

Acacius of Seleucia 213, 220, 235-237, 240,
242-243, 256, 261

Achamoth 459

Adam 107, 122, 136, 145, 164, 190, 192-193,
225-226

Adam, Alfred 90

Aerian 13

Aetius 455-457, 491

Aetius (of Eleutheropolis?) 489

Afghanistan 250

Africa 386

Agapet (Habib) of Beit-Lapat 230, 260-261,
263-266, 268, 270, 276

Egypt 293, 295, 297, 351, 371, 382, 386, 405,
434, 456-457, 466-467, 470-471, 488,
490-491, 494

Aḥudemmeḥ 173

Ahrens, Karl 239

Aland, Kurt 379

Alkinoos 432

Aleppo 232

Alexander of Alexandria 320, 325-326, 372,
382, 386, 455

Alexander of Aphrodisias 450 Alexander
of Hierapolis 146

Alexandria 4, 92, 220, 226, 231, 239, 243,
256, 345, 369, 371-372, 381-382, 386,
405-406, 466, 469-470, 488, 491

Aloger 16

Ambrose of Milan 132-133, 144, 386, 431

Amelius 414-420, 431, 479

Amida 232

Amman, É. 282

Ammonius 300

Anastasius, Emperor 292

Anastasius, presbyter 409-410

Anastos, Milton V. 363, 365-366

Andrew of Samosata 5, 121

Angelic 17-18

Anhomoe 444, 495

Antioch 4, 155-159, 221, 229, 232-233,
237-239, 243, 252, 256, 258, 266, 277,
292, 335-336, 338, 341-345, 348-353,
355-357, 376-377, 390, 412, 469-470

Antonius, presbyter 409

Aphraat 143

Apollinaris of Laodicea 8, 28, 46, 221, 283-
284, 286, 307, 309, 332-333, 367, 371,
379, 389-390, 392, 396-397

Apollinarists 13

Monastery of the Apostles 293

Apuleius 432

Arabia 489

Archontic 488

Arian (incl. anti-Arian) 104, 132-133, 176,
182, 185-187, 189, 193, 288, 307-308,
310-311, 313, 319-321, 324-330, 332, 334,
340, 343, 367, 380-381, 385, 387-389,
399-401, 404, 430, 443-444, 448, 454-
456, 459, 472, 493

Arius 162, 307-308, 325-326, 329, 346, 354,
381-383, 386, 455, 457

Armenia 259, 489-490

Armstrong, Arthur Hilary 445, 492

Asia, Diocese 243

Assemani, Giuseppe Simone 104, 266, 270,
282

Asterius 307-308, 313, 329

Athanasius 7, 132-133, 144-145, 186, 293,
307-330, 339, 341, 345, 372, 381-382,
385-387, 391, 399-404, 412, 430, 457,
470, 489, 495

Audian 13

Augustin 391, 403-404, 415, 431, 451-453

Augustus 356

Auxentius of Milan 341, 343

Azerbaijan 244, 251

- Baarda, Tjitze 175, 178-180
 Babai, Katholikos 237, 239-243, 256
 Babai 87-150, 154, 159, 196, 199-202, 204-206, 218, 293-295, 364, 366
 Badoqa Bazud/Abzud 170, 173
 Bahram IV. 229, 264
 Baltes, Matthias 465
 Bar Bahlul 170, 245
 Barba'semin 274
 Barbel, Josef 369
 Barbelites 454
 Barbelo 435
 Bardy, Gustave 313
 Bar 'Edta 90, 374
 Barhadbeshabba 304
 Bar Hebraeus 271-272, 274 Baršabba'e s. Simeon
 Bar Sarošway
 Barsauma of Nisibis 220, 235-240, 242, 248, 256
 Basil of Caesarea 7, 129, 159, 282, 293, 301, 319, 333, 339, 341-342, 390, 462
 Bauer, Johannes 113
 Bauer, Walter 379
 Baumstark, Anton 166-168, 269-271
 Bebis, Georgios 366
 Beulay, Robert 195-196, 206-207
 Bedjan, Paul 34, 117, 120-121, 149, 196, 202-204, 214-216, 218, 288-291, 363-364
 Beit Aramayē 248
 Contribution 'Edrai 240
 Beit Huzaye 241, 262
 Beit Lapat 235, 237, 240-241, 254, 262
 Bethany 327
 Bethge, Hans-G. 477
 Berytos 326
 Bithynia 375
 Blum, G.G. 5
 Borborian 455-456, 491
 Börtzler, Friedrich 419
 Bou Mansour, Tanios 226
 Braun, Oskar 34, 260, 266, 271-275
 Brenke, Ursula 422, 427
 Brennecke, Hanns Christof 318, 339
 Brière, Maurice 191, 363
 Brisson, Luc 414-420
 Brock, Sebastian Paul 154-155, 160, 175, 209-210, 374
 Brockelmann, Carl 32
 Brooks, Ernest W. 239
 Bruns, Peter 77, 229
 Budge, E.A. Wallis 173
 Caelestinus of Rome 466-468
 Caesarea Philippi 327
 Calendion s. Kalandion
 Cambridge 29, 281
 Campenhausen, Hans von 379, 385
 Candidus 461
 Canossa 249
 Capelle, Bernard 156-158
 Caspar, Erich 458
 Caspari, Carl Paul 155, 159-160, 358 Celsus s. Kelsos
 Chabot, Jean-Baptiste 34, 89, 96, 144, 160-163, 220, 228-232, 234-236, 239-242, 244-250, 252-258, 261-267, 269-270, 373
 Chadwick, Henry 113
 Chalcedony 375
 Chalcidius 140
 Chaldaea inferior 248
 Charisius, Presbyter 159, 221, 405-413, 468-469
 Chesnut, Roberta C. 226
 Ciasca, Agostino 181
 Clark Wire, Antoinette 481, 474, 488, 492
 Clement of Alexandria 386, 432, 475
 Cluny 295
 Coakley, J.F. 153
 Connolly, Richard Hugh 153-156, 159, 163-164
 Courcelle, Pierre 452-453
 Crouzel, Henri 4
 Cyrus of Edessa 91, 154, 165, 182, 213
 Dadisho Qatraya 202-203, 293-304
 Dadisho, Katholikos 256-269
 Daley, Brian E. 52-55, 60-61, 69, 79-82, 84-85
 Damasus of Rome 341
 Dardania 238
 de Bruin, Cebus Cornelis 182
 de Durand, Georges-Matthieu 185, 187, 191-192
 de Halleux, André 7, 79, 97-98, 104-105, 118, 144, 150, 208-211, 214, 216-218, 243, 288-292, 333, 335, 343, 358-359, 363, 369-373, 378, 394, 466-467
 de Lagarde, Paul 23, 37-78
 Denzinger, Heinrich Joseph Dominikus 337- 338, 352, 358, 360-361, 378, 383, 391, 393

- des Places, Édouard 403, 427, 445
 de Vries, Wilhelm 89, 210, 228
 Devreesse, Robert 27, 30-31, 33-35, 55, 70, 77,
 85, 100, 132, 282, 336, 408
 Didymus 302
 Diepen, Herman 27
 Diettrich, Gustav 159
 Dindorf, Wilhelm 20
 Diodorus of Tarsus 3-4, 7-8, 24, 28, 145, 182,
 191-192, 194, 203, 225, 281, 342, 350,
 407
 Dionys of Alexandria 319, 323, 380-381 Dionys
 of Rome 319
 Dionysius bar Salibi 104-105
 Dioscorus of Alexandria 149
 Dodds, Eric Robertson 112-113
 Dossetti, Giuseppe Luigi 158-160, 337, 352,
 358-360
 Dörrie, Heinrich 140-141, 414-418, 420, 479
 Draguet, René 35-36, 79-83, 111, 203, 293-
 295, 299-301, 304, 373
 Driver, Godfrey Rolles 363
 Duval, Rubens 209, 214, 218

 'Ebed-Jesu 173, 240, 254, 261, 266, 276-277,
 282
 Ebied, R.Y. 3-4, 6
 Ebionites 489
 Eden 177, 185
 Edessa 25, 105, 145, 167, 208, 210, 213, 216-
 217, 220-221, 232, 373
 Eleutheropolis 489
 Elias 181
 Elijah of Nisibis 254
 Elie Djauhari 270
 Elisa 245, 251
 Ephesus 5-6, 15, 70-71, 92, 159, 221, 351, 368-
 371, 405-407, 410, 412, 466, 468-470
 Ephraem 143, 150, 175, 178-185, 187, 226, 243,
 271
 Ps. ephraem 227
 Epiphanius 4-6, 8, 10-21, 182, 407, 454-458,
 460, 488-491
 Euagrius Ponticus 112, 195-207, 293, 299-300
 Euagrius of Antioch 338
 Eudoxius 444
 Eunomian 332, 334, 388-389, 409, 455, 457,
 495
 Eunomius 281-382, 453-454
 Europe (surrounding area of Constantinople) 405
 Euseb of Caesarea 381-382, 385, 387, 403-
 404, 414-416, 479
 Euseb of Doryäum 159, 355-356 Euseb
 of Emesa 145
 Euseb of Nicomedia 307, 326, 383
 Eusebians 307, 310, 312-315, 319, 321,
 324-326, 330, 333, 339, 386, 390-391,
 399-404, 420
 Eusebius of Rome 272
 Eustathius of Antioch 145, 356
 Eutactus 489-491
 Eutyches 107, 149, 176

 Facundus of Hermiane 22-24, 27, 99, 281,
 408
 Faller, Otto 132
 Feghali, Joseph 259
 Festugière, André-Jean 113, 351, 470
 Fiey, Jean-Maurice 208-210, 214, 228-232,
 234-235, 237, 239, 242-243, 246, 250,
 255-257, 259-261, 271-272, 274
 Flavian of Constantinople 120, 232, 338, 345,
 353
 Frankenberg, Wilhelm 89, 195, 197, 200
 Frankfurt 22
 Frishman, Judith 154-155, 373
 Funk, Wolf-Peter 421-422
 Furlani, Giuseppe 166-172, 174

 Geerard, Maurice 22, 363
 Gelasius I 238, 243
 George I, Catholicos
 227
 Gerö, Stephen 228, 235, 240, 257-259, 270,
 495
 Bumped, J. 19
 Gnostics s. Subject index s. v. Gnosis
 Goodman, Alan E. 89, 92, 119, 143, 166, 179,
 281, 287, 374
 Gorothenian 12
 Gregory of Elvira 317
 Gregory of Nazianzus 351,
 366 Gregory of Nyssa 113
 Gregory Thaumaturgos 4
 Gribomont, Jean 363, 366-367
 Grillmeier, Alois 22-23, 92-93, 129, 166, 211,
 220, 235, 254, 331, 363, 365-368, 372,
 378
 Guenther, Otto 237
 Guillaumont, Antoine 89-91, 100, 103, 111-113,
 131, 198, 206, 212, 214

- Habbi, Joseph 244, 259
 Ḥabib 213, 217, 220, 223, 225-226
 Ḥabib-Agapet s. Agapet
 Hadot, Pierre 414, 420-422, 424-432, 435-451, 453, 459, 461, 464, 472-481, 483, 492, 494-495
 Hage, Wolfgang 260
 Hahn, August and Ludwig 144, 337, 352, 356-357
 Hall 213
 Hainthaler, Theresia 219-220, 228
 Haneberg, Daniel 159-160
 Hansen, Günter Christian 157
 Harnack, Adolf von 376, 397
 Hausherr, Irénée 195-199, 204, 206
 Hebron 489
 Henry IV, Emperor 249
 Helen, Queen 272
 Henana of Nisibis 34, 89, 91, 95, 97, 100-101, 112, 119, 130-131, 167, 211, 214, 218-219, 374
 Ḥenanišo the monk 95, 218
 Henry, Paul 422, 472
 Heraclides 363
 Heraclitus 416-417, 479
 Herodian 12
 Hespel, Robert 35-36, 55, 79-83, 111, 373
 Jerome 113, 391 Hilarius of Poitiers 444 Hippolytus 449, 460
 Hodgson, Leonhard 363
 Holl, Karl 10-11, 13-21
 Hormizd, Deacon 168, 171
 Hosea of Nisibis 260, 265
 Hübner, Reinhart 113, 129
 Hünermann, Peter 360-361, 378, 383, 387-388, 391, 393

 Ibas of Edessa 221 Innocent of Maronea 72, 75
 Iran 250
 Irenaeus of Lyons 429, 432, 434, 443, 459, 463-464, 482-483, 489, 491-493
 Isaac of Nineveh 195-196, 199, 202-207
 Isaac of Seleucia-Ktesiphon 228, 230-232, 255, 258, 261, 264
 Isaiah of Gaza 293-304
 Isaiah of Taḥal 218
 Israel/ites 133, 205, 234
 Išo' yahb I. 153, 160, 256
 Išo' yahb II. 208
 Išo' yahb III. 159, 208-209, 214, 218

 Jacob of Nisibis 271-272, 275
 Jakob von Sarug 220, 225-227
 James, presbyter 409-411
 James, choir bishop 411
 Jamblich 428, 473, 483
 Jammo, Sarhad Y. Hermiz 154, 156
 Jansma, Taeke 226
 Jansen, Till 40, 52-55, 60-61, 66, 69, 79-84
 Jedin, Hubert 239
 Jerusalem 243, 256, 489
 Jobius 284
 John the Baptist 453 John (Evangelist) 416, 482
 John, comes 469
 John of Antioch 368, 379-371, 407-408, 411, 466-468, 470
 John Cassian 159, 352, 355-358
 Johannes Chrysostomus 232, 293, 301, 352-355, 357
 John of Dalyatha 195-196, 206-207
 John of Damascus 17, 19 John, Metropolitan of Alqosh 168
 John the Seer (for Joseph Hazzaya?) 293 Joseph of Seleucia 244, 269-272
 Joseph Ḥazzāyā 82, 196, 211
 Jouassard, Georges 182, 186-187, 193
 Juda Kyriakos of Jerusalem 272 Jews 12, 190, 288
 Julian, Emperor 415
 Justin 380
 Justinian I, Emperor 34, 91, 212, 378

 Kaiser, Ursula U. 477
 Kalandius/Kalandion, Patriarch 157-158, 238, 292
 Kannengiesser, Charles 307-310, 313, 315, 324-326, 328-330
 Karka de Lēdan 262 Cathars 411
 Kellermann, Mechtild 219, 228, 421, 495
 Kelly, John Norman Davidson 155-158, 314
 Kelsos 415
 Kephars Baricha 489
 Khalifé-Hachem, Éllie 196, 202-204
 Cilicia 456, 491
 Kinzig, Wolfram 313, 330
 Lesser Armenia 490-491

- Kmosko, Michael 246, 271
 Köbert, Raymond 22-23, 26, 37, 43, 60-61, 78, 211
 Kokaba 489
 Kōkē 232, 241-242, 246-247, 255, 263, 273, 275, 277
 Kolorbasioi 16
 Constantine 375, 387, 457
 Constantinople 92, 156-158, 214, 216, 219, 221, 237-239, 243, 256, 288, 291-292, 334-335, 338, 345-346, 350-351, 357, 363, 365, 367, 371, 374-378, 393, 405, 409-410, 466-467
 Constantius, Emperor 489
 Kosmas Indikopleustes 90, 231, 252, 256
 Kosrau, Grand King 89
 Kottayam (Kerala) 22, 29
 Kreschensteiner, Kosef 143
 Kroll, Wilhelm 427
 Krüger, Gustav 239
 Krüger, Paul 226
 Ctesiphon 246
 Cyril of Alexandria 4, 6, 74, 92, 130, 135, 141, 149, 175, 185-194, 221-222, 226, 365-366, 368-374, 378, 393, 397, 405, 407-408, 411, 413, 466-470
 Cyrillians 107, 194, 220-221, 224-225, 241, 368, 270, 372-373, 378, 397, 413, 467-468
 Kyros s. Cyrus
- Labort, Jérôme 112, 229-230, 233, 241, 243, 248, 257, 259-261, 264, 268-271, 274
 Lagarde s. de Lagarde
 Lampe, Geoffrey W.H. 17, 200, 322
 Layton, Bentley 420
 Lazarus 115
 Lebon, Joseph 7-8, 55, 187-188, 337, 350, 358-359, 363
 Leloir, Louis 178-181
 Leo of Rome 149
 Leontius of Byzantium 23, 28, 33, 37, 95
 Leontius of Jerusalem 94-95, 119
 Liberipatrian 14
 Liberius of Rome 457-458 Libya 381
 Liébaert, Jacques 185-186
 Linguiti, Alessandro 447
 London 29, 96
 Löhr, Winrich 228
- Loofs, Friedrich 99, 104, 133-134, 281, 314, 316, 318, 350, 363
 Luisier, Philippe 421
 Lydia 405, 407, 409-410
- Macedonia 343
 Macina, Robert 304
 MacDermot, Violet 492
 Macomber, William F. 91, 165, 182, 213
 Mahoza 246
 May, Angelo 275
 Milan 243
 Majercik, Ruth 403, 431, 444, 451, 480, 493-494
 Macarine 296
 Ma'na 260
 Mani 302, 455, 459
 Manicheans 288
 Mansfeld, Jaap 460
 Mansi, Gian Domenico 35.82, 375
 Mar Aba, Katholikos (Πατριῳκος) 91, 214, 231-232, 241, 243-244, 246-257, 261-262, 265, 269, 271, 273, 277, 373
 Mar Aphrem 272
 Marcian (monk) 7
 Mar Emmeh 208
 Mare 274
 Margoliouth s. Payne-Smith
 Mari 246
 Maria 19, 99, 101, 104-105, 144, 146, 223, 225, 350, 356, 361-362, 368, 371, 377, 388, 391-396, 473
 Marius Mercator 11, 134
 Marius Victorinus 414-415, 419-464, 472-495
 Markell of Ankyra 144-145, 310, 318-319, 321, 333-334, 339, 381, 390-391, 399, 403, 454, 457
 Markian 375
 Markion 18, 455
 Marksches, Christoph 307, 331, 465
 Markus Eremita 293, 299-300
 Maron, Deacon 221
 Mar Paulus 249
 Martin, François 373
 Martyrius-Sahdona 118-119, 208-219
 Maruta of Maipherkat 232-234 Marwei of Beit Lapat 241
 Maximilian of Constantinople 469
 Macedonians 335
 McCarthy, Carmel 178

- McLeod, Frederick G. 154-155, 175-177, 373
 Meletian 145, 158, 333, 335-336, 338, 341, 343-345, 350, 390-391, 412
 Meletius of Antioch 338-339, 342, 345, 367
 Memnon of Ephesus 405, 468-469
 Merw 241
 Mesopotamia 259
 Messalian 299, 405
 Messos 486
 Methodius of Olympus 8, 112
 Metzler, Karin 228
 Michael Malpana/Badoqa 95, 166-174
 Milès of Susa 260, 268, 272, 274
 Mina, Priest 227
 Mingana, Alphonse 25-26, 35, 76, 153-156, 164, 175, 337
 Moberg, Axel 6
 Moeller, Charles 95
 Monarchian 443
 Mondésert, Claude 453
 Montanists 14
 Mookken, George Davis 366
 Mopsuestia 338, 352, 357
 Genesis 106
 Moss, Cyril 166
 Moutsoulas, Elias 311
 Müller, Guido 188, 319, 321, 323, 402
 Muyldermans, Joseph 195, 197-198, 200, 205
 Nag Hammadi 414, 496, see Gnostica source list and Gnosis subject index
- Narcissus 318
 Narsai/Narses 153-156, 159, 175-178, 181-182, 184-185, 193-194, 213, 217, 220, 222-226, 246, 251, 360, 373-374
 Ps. narsai 153-164, 182
 Nau, François 4, 93, 117, 120-121, 149, 215, 288-289, 363-364, 371
 Nazoreans 489
 Nemesius 140
 Neoterius 412
 Nestorius 3-4, 6, 15, 28, 33, 90-94, 99, 103, 117-118, 120-121, 129, 133-134, 146, 149, 215-216, 218-219, 221-222, 281, 288, 303, 350-351, 356, 363-374, 378, 393, 396, 408-410, 413, 466-471
 Ps. Nestorius (in Liber Heraclidis) 33, 93-94, 101, 118, 121, 208, 214-219, 288-292, 363-367
- Nicomedia 326
 Nilus of Ankyra 195-197
 Nisibis 167, 210-211, 213-214, 216-218, 220, 248, 253-254, 299, 373-374
 Nicaea s. Subject index Creed Nicene Creed
 Novatian 380-382, 410
 Novatians 411-412
 Numenius 416, 421, 431-432, 440, 442, 445
- Ochrida 8
 Oñatiba, Ignacio 202
 Opitz, Hans-Georg 319, 323, 325-326, 382, 455
 Orbe, Antonio 433
 Oriens, diocese 233, 351, 408, 466
 Origen 108, 112-113, 302, 314, 321, 380, 475
 Ortiz de Urbina, Ignacio 27, 129, 166, 394
 Ossius 318, 387 Overbeck, Julian Joseph 5 Oxford 129, 331, 359, 399
- Palestine 112, 457, 489, 491
 Pamphilus of Jerusalem 95
 Pamphylia 405
 Papa of Seleucia 229-230, 256-258, 260-261, 263-264, 267-276
 Papdopoulos-Kerameus, Athanasius 353
 Parente, Pietro 27
 Parmentier, Léon 316-318, 331, 388, 399
 St. Paul 101, 139, 283, 299-300, 302-303, 380, 430
 Paul of Beit-Lapat 249, 253
 Paul of Nisibis 91, 214
 Paul of Samosata 18, 99, 110, 131, 326, 356, 366
 Paul of Seleucia 244, 246, 250-251
 Paulinian 288
 Paulinus of Antioch 338, 343, 345
 Payne-Smith-Margoliouth, Jessie 203, 245, 248, 254
 Payne Smith, Robert 32, 72, 103, 245, 254
 Pearson, Birger A. 421, 483
 Peeters, Paul 226
 Pepucian 13
 Peraten 449
 Pericoli-Ridolfini, F. 5
 Peroz-Šabor 248
 Persis 248, 251, 373-374

- St. Peter 101, 139, 258, 283
 Petrus Fullo 5, 157, 238-239
 Petrus Mongus 239
 Peter, γέπων in Palestine 489-490
 Peter, Chief Notary of Alexandria 405-406, 408
 Philadelphia 405, 407, 409-411, 468
 Philastrius of Brescia 14
 Philippopolis 311
 Philo 416, 433
 Philoxenus of Mabbug 5, 7, 9, 93-94, 97-98,
 101, 104-108, 144-145, 148-150, 176, 213,
 220-221, 241, 288-292
 Photin 454
 Photius 282, 294
 Photius, Presbyter 409-410
 Plato 416, 433, 483
 Plisch, Uwe-Karsten 421-422
 Plotinus 129, 414-416, 422, 427-429, 431, 433-
 434, 444-445, 448, 460, 472, 480-482,
 488, 491-494, 496
 Pneuit 495
 Pneumatomachen 16, 332, 334, 388-389
 Poimen 296
 Pontius Pilate 361-362, 377
 Pontus 243
 Porphyrius (Neoplatonist) 113, 403, 414-415,
 419, 422, 431-432, 441, 444-451, 454,
 480, 488, 491, 494
 Porphyrius of Antioch 232
 Priscillians 13
 Priskian 140
 Proclus (Neoplatonist) 112, 403
 Ptolemy (Gnostic) 459, 463-464
 Pulcheria 375
 Pusey, Philip Edward 11

 Quartadecimans 407, 410-412, 468
 Quintillians 13

 Rabban Shapur 296
 Rabbula of Edessa 5
 Rabkennare 293
 Rahmani, Ign. Ephraem 154
 Ravenna 243
 Rehm, Bernhard 453-454
 Reinink, Gerrit J. 167, 169
 Reuß, Joseph 78, 188
 Richard, Marcel 8, 22-23, 25, 27-31, 33, 49,
 53, 55, 60, 64-66, 70-71, 74-75, 92, 211,
 284, 341-342

 Ritter, Adolf, Martin 335-336, 344, 351-352,
 377
 Rucker, Ignaz 7
 Rücker, Adolf 337, 357
 Robinson, James M. 495
 Rome 18, 22, 119, 129, 149, 154, 161, 233,
 237-238, 243, 256, 272-273, 335-337,
 340-352, 356, 377, 390, 414, 431, 434,
 452, 456-460, 466, 468, 472-473, 491,
 493-495
 Rufin 453

 Sabellian 12, 289, 381
 Sabellius 332, 334, 354, 391, 454
 Sabinus, deacon 341, 343
 Sachau, Eduard 22, 29-32, 35, 40-84, 154
 Sadducees 16
 Saffrey, Henry Dominique 447
 Sahdona s. Martyrius Sahdona
 Šahdost 274
 Salamis 489, 491
 Solomon of Bosra
 Samaritan 12
 Šapur II. 229, 274
 Satale 490
 Scheidweiler, Felix 318, 388, 399
 Schenke, Hans-Martin 421-422, 477, 483,
 486-487, 492
 Scher, Addai 35-36, 79-83, 111, 168, 211, 373
 Schilling, Alexander 228, 266
 Schmidt, Carl 492
 Schönfelder, Joseph Maria 159-160 Schönmetzer,
 Adolf 337-338, 358, 360-361
 Schwaigert, Wolfgang 268
 Schwartz, Eduard 3-5, 7, 237-239, 318, 330,
 339-344, 356, 363, 369, 375, 405-408,
 412-413, 468-469
 Scipioni, Luigi I. 89-91, 117-118, 120, 127, 129,
 365-367
 Seert 173, 211
 Segestan 250, 254
 Seibt, Klaus 318, 333
 Seleucia (near Ctesiphon) 246, 256
 Seleukia-Ktesiphon 228-233, 235, 240-242,
 244, 246-248, 251, 255-256, 259, 261,
 263, 266, 270, 273, 277
 Seneca 449
 Seth 489, 491
 Sethian 450, 488-489, 491
 Severian 16

- Severus of Antioch 9, 107, 146, 187-189, 292, 363
 Shenute 495
 Seven, Hermann Josef 185
 Sieber, John H. 420, 445, 477, 486, 492
 Silvanus of Qardu 83
 Šila of Hormizd-Ardasir 242
 Šila, archdeacon (= of Seleukia?) 242 Šila of Seleukia 243, 248, 250
 Simeon (Baršabba'e) of Beit-Lapat 268-269, 271, 274
 Simplician 415, 452-453, 458, 460
 Simplicius of Rome 238
 Sirmium 243
 Smith, Andrew 419, 431, 447
 Socrates 445
 Socrates Scholasticus 326
 Socomenus 228, 231
 Staats, Reinhart 335, 350
 Stead, Christopher 310, 325, 330
 Stilicho 229
 Stülcken, Alfred 311-312
 Sullivan, Francis A. 23-24, 27, 33
 Susiana 248
 Swete, Henry Barclay 22, 40, 52-55, 66, 69-71, 74-75, 77, 79-82, 84-85, 94, 132, 146, 282
- Talya of Edessa 6, 15
 Tardieu, Michel 414, 419-422, 429, 431-445, 447-449, 453-456, 459, 464, 472-478, 480-483, 492, 495
 Taskodrugites 14
 Tella 232
 Tertullian 141, 367, 380, 386, 443
 Tetz, Martin 145, 307, 309-310, 314-319, 330, 345, 356-357, 399-400
 Theiler, Willy 447
 Thekla 302-304
 Theodorus Anagostes/Lector 157-158
 Theodor bar Koni 34-35, 37, 61, 82-83, 85, 111-112, 173, 211, 373
 Theodor of Mopsuestia 1-85, 94, 99-100, 103, 133-134, 140, 143, 145-146, 153-155, 158-161, 163-164, 182, 188, 191, 193, 202-203, 210-211, 215, 220-221, 227, 281-286, 293-304, 336-338, 340, 342-343-354, 357-360, 364, 367, 374, 407-410, 413, 468
 Theodoret of Cyrus 4, 7, 24, 92, 217, 293, 303, 316-318, 331, 343, 449
 Theodosius I 229, 351, 375
 Theodosius II 375, 406, 466
 Theophanius 411
 Theophilus of Alexandria 232 Thessalonica 343
 Thomas 273
 Thome, Felix 219, 495
 Thomson, R.W. 7
 Thrace, Diocese 243
 Timothy, Catholicos 217, 254
 Timothy Aelurus 3-7, 11, 176 Timothy of Constantinople 158
 Tommasi (Moreschini), Chiara Ombretta 449-452, 459, 491
 Tonneau, Raymond 25, 35, 76-77, 85, 100, 336, 338, 340, 346-347, 358-359
 Tübingen 22, 37, 293, 331
 Turkmenistan 241
 Turner, Cuthbertus Hamilton 343-345, 348
 Turner, Canon 129
 Turner, John D. 481-482, 484-485
- Ulrich, Jörg 427, 457-458 Ursacius of Singidunum 315-317
- Valens of Mursa 315-317
 Valentin 17, 422, 443-444, 449, 455, 464, 474
 Valentinian II 466
 van Esbroeck, Michel 119
 Vaschalde, Arthur Adolphe 89, 96-97, 99-100, 102-103, 111, 114, 120, 125, 127-128, 136-138, 140-141, 144, 147-149, 294
 Fathers s. Desert
 Fathers Veh Ardašir 246
 Victorinus of Pettau 143
 Vigilius of Rome 23, 33
 Vosté, Jacques-Marie 25
- Waldstein, Michael 483
 Waszink, Jan Hendrik 106
 Weis, Heinz-Gerhard 203
 Wenger, Antoine 352-3554
 Wensinck, Arent Jan 196, 202-204
 Westphal, Gustav 259-260, 268
 Wickham, Lionel R. 3-4, 6
 Williams, Frank 182, 490
 Winkler, Dietmar W. 209 Wisse, Frederik 483
 Wolska, Wanda 90
 Wright, William 3, 14, 28-30, 168
 Desert Fathers 293, 299, 301

Yahbalaha 258, 260-261, 264

Zacharias Rhetor 238-239

Zamasp 240

Zeno, Emperor 239, 292

Zoroaster 414

Cyprus 405, 489

Subject index

- Acacian schism 237
Altnicenisism 158, 333, 338-339, 347, 412
Aristotelianism 106, 129, 435
assumptio 143-145
ἀσύγχυτος ἔνωσις 35, 192, 334, 391, 393, 396-397
ἀσυχγύτως 149, 376
Resurrection body 105, 108, 111-117, 128
- Incarnation of Christ 104-108
Dispute 166
- Disputation of 562/563 91, 103, 110, 131, 212-213
Three-chapter dispute 4, 95, 357, 408
- Residency/habitatio 141-142, 145
Epitome 5, 97, 157
Excerpt 164, 178, 191
- Fasting 13
Filioque 294, 336, 377
Meat (σάϋξ) 11, 111
- Robe (as a description of the humanity of Jesus) 145-148
Confessions of faith
- Antiochenum (A) 153, 155, 157, 159-163, 337, 357-358
- 3rd Antiochian formula 159
- 4th Antiochian formula 310
- Apostolicum 377
- Chalcedonense of 451 3-4, 7, 11, 22, 28, 92, 104, 332, 365, 368, 374-376, 378, 394-398, 413
- Formula of agreement (Laetentur letter) to Ephesus/Ephesinum (433) 221, 368, 370, 390-393, 470
- Ecthesis/formula makrostichos 310-312, 339, 404
- of Charisius in Ephesus 431, 159, 221, 405-413
- Formula of Constantinople/Empire dogma 360 159
- Nestorianum s. Antiochenum
- of Euseb of Caesarea in Nicaea 325 385, 387
- Nicaenum (N) 108, 144, 153, 155-156, 158, 160-162, 215, 321, 336-337, 343-344, 348, 350-351, 357, 368, 371, 373, 376-379, 383-389, 392, 405-406, 408, 412-413, 457, 459, 467-470
- Nicaenum, extended in Rome: 336, 344, 347-349
- Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum (C) 144, 156-157, 159-163, 294, 331-362, 335-337, 346-351, 357, 376-378, 386, 388, 390
- Formula from Nike 159
- Romano-Nicaenum (edited in Antioch 379) 161, 348-352, 357, 377
- Romanum 348, 350, 377, 452
- Serdicense, western 307, 313-319, 322, 345, 399, 412
- Serdicense, eastern 310-311
- 3rd Sirmian formula 159
- the Synod of Išo' yahb I. 585 153, 160, 163
- Tomus of 382 331-333, 339, 345-346, 352, 388-391
Gloss 14, 17, 118-119, 129, 286-287, 318
Gnosis 414, 428, 433, 435, 442-445, 448, 451, 454-459, 463-464, 472, 475, 480-481, 487, 489-496
- barbelognostic 450, 456, 458-460, 472-473, 481-487, 489, 491-494
Gold coin comparison 124
- Manuscripts
- Athens, Χριστιανική Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία 9 (Collectio Atheniensis) 405, 468
- Berlin, Petermann State Library I9 168- 172
- Berlin, State Library Ms. lat. 79 (Phillips 1776) 238
- Berlin, Egyptian Museum, Papyrus 8502 482-483
- Cambridge, University Library Ms. orient. 1319 89, 95, 119, 143, 166, 179, 281-287, 363, 374
- Cambridge, University Library add. 2812 168-169, 171-172
- Dublin, Chester Beatty Ms. 709 178-180
- Jena, University and State Library Ms. Bos. f.1 19-20

- London, British Library 8606 7
- London, British Library add. 12156 1-85, 130-131
- London, British Library add. 12157 55
- London, British Library add. 14538 167, 169-172
- London. British Library add. 14669 22-36, 57-61, 64-67, 79-85, 211-212, 364
- London, British Library add. 17198 5-6
- London, British Library Or. oct. 1132 168
- London, Indian Office 9 168-172
- Mardin 62 168
- Montecassino lat. 2 (Collectio Casinensis) 8, 469
- Munich, BSB Cod. orient. 147 159-160
- Paris, BN Fonds grec 913 195, 197
- Paris BN Coislin 32 (Collectio Segueriana) 8, 469
- Paris, BN Ms. syriacae 332 228
- Rabban Hormizd Monastery (near Mosul) 168
- Roma, Museo Borgia ms. K VI,4 228
- Semences (near Alqosh), Notre-Dame convent, Ms. 52 168
- Semences (near Alqosh), Notre-Dame convent, Ms. 142 168
- Vatican BAV gr. 503 11
- Vatican, BAV gr. 830 (Collectio Vaticana) 466-470
- Vatican, BAV Barb. Gr. 515 197
- Vatican, BAV Borg. Syr. 82 5
- Vatican, BAV lat. 1319 (Collectio Casinensis) 469
- Vatican, BAV Syr. 179 281
- Vatican, BAV Urb. graec. 17/18 13
- Verona, Biblioteca capitolare LX (58) 340-344
- Haplography 13, 318
- Heresy 11-21
- Homoeism 339, 345
- Homeusian theology 444, 458, 461
- Homousia 99, 182, 284, 333-334, 385-386, 390, 392, 396, 426, 453, 459, 472
- Hymns 294-296
- Hypostasis 22, 33-35, 57-61, 79-83, 122, 124, 129, 140, 221-223, 226, 282-283
- Two-hypostasis doctrine 89, 91-95, 109-110, 117, 124, 128, 221, 227
- Three-hypostasis doctrine 316, 319-320, 326, 333, 338, 342, 390-391
- ὑπόστασις σύνθετος 91, 94-95, 212, 219, 281, 286
- hypostasis subsistens 126-128
- Hypostatic unification (ἑνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν) 95, 109
- Identification theology 379
- Itacism 16
- Chapter headings 96
- Colophon 4, 6, 14-15, 166, 168-171, 341-342
- Compilation 235
- Council
 - of Antioch 324/325 320
 - of Nicaea 325 334, 375
 - from Tyrus 335 457
 - of Antioch 341 339, 461
 - from Serdika 343 313, 330, 403
 - from Sirmium 351 461
 - from Milan 355 458
 - from Rimini 359 341
 - From Alexandria 362 391
 - of Antioch 379 335, 340-342, 344, 350, 377, 391
 - of Constantinople 381 331, 334-336, 338, 345-347, 355, 367, 375-377, 390-391
 - of Constantinople 382 331, 335, 350, 391
 - of Seleucia 410 144, 228-233, 242, 259, 261, 277
 - of the Yahbalaha from 420 231-233, 261
 - of Dadišo from 424 229-231, 234-235, 241-242, 247, 256-269, 271
 - of Ephesus 431 92, 159, 351-352, 367-371, 375, 378, 393, 405, 409, 466-471
- Agreement of 433 221, 368, 370, 378
- of Ephesus 449 120, 221
- of Chalcedon 451 220, 234, 237, 243, 292, 335, 350-352, 375
- of the Barsauma of Beit Lapat 484 235-237, 240-241, 248
- of Acacius from 486 231, 235
- of Babai from 497 231, 239-242, 247
- of Mar Aba from 544 231-232, 244-255
- of Constantinople 553 164, 212, 413
- of Joseph of 554 231, 244, 269
- of Išo'yahb I from 585 256
- from 612 32, 89, 91-92, 109, 212
- in the Vatican 1962-1965 (Vatican II) 368, 370, 387-388
- Coptic 435, 442, 455-456, 488, 495-496
- Liturgical staff 155

Mass, Chaldean 154
 Miaphysitism (monophysitism) 3-4, 9-10,
 92, 120, 125, 145, 150
 Middle Platonism 432-434, 444, 449, 491

 Nature (φύσις) 11, 33, 57-61, 79-83, 107-108
 — μία φύσις 289
 Nestorianism 90-95, 100, 103-104, 131, 160,
 210
 New Chalcedonism 34, 91, 94-95, 119, 125,
 129, 208, 212, 214-215, 281, 374
 Niceneism 158, 182, 333, 335, 338-339,
 347, 352, 367, 404, 458
 Neo-Palamitism 366
 Neoplatonism 112-113, 128, 403, 414, 416,
 434, 440-441, 446-447, 452, 460, 483
 Nisibian theology/School of Nisibis 90, 103,
 167, 211-214, 220, 299, 373-374
 Niceness 99

 Origenism 91, 112, 145, 297, 383
 ὄχημα 112-113

 Palimpsest 5-6
 Patripassianism 381, 426, 430, 444
 Person (πρόσωπον) 22, 27, 32-35, 57-61,
 79-83, 93-94, 109, 119, 121, 123-125, 129,
 222, 282-283
 — Liturgical πρόσωπον 103
 — Disclosure-πρόσωπον 103
 — unitives 103, 122-124, 127, 141, 143
 — persona naturalis et hypostatica 117-119
 — πρόσωπον ὑποστατικόν 218

— πρόσωπον τῆς ἐνώσεως 119, 121-123,
 140-141
 Peshitta 32, 69, 135
 Quaternions 6

 Anointing of Jesus 130-135
 Sun in the mirror-comparison 109, 122-123,
 142 Statue of the king-comparison 146
 Stoa 113, 129, 140-141, 367, 435, 444
 σύγχυσις 222, 281
 συνάφεια 140-142, 193, 286
 σύνθεσις φυσική 289 Synod
 s. Council
 Syriac translation 5, 7, 11, 13-19, 24-26,
 32, 64-67, 69, 91, 130-131, 199-200, 213,
 359

 Baptism of Jesus 134-135, 138-139
 Temple (as an image for the human nature of
 Jesus) 146-147
 Theotokos predicate (θεοτόκος) 95, 370-371,
 393, 396, 470
 Theopaschitism 4
 Trishagion 157

 unio naturalis et hypostatica (cf. Hyposta- se)
 107, 117, 119, 222
 unitive s. person History of
 science 90
 Miracles of Jesus 114-117, 139, 147-149, 290
 Number symbolism 285
 Citation formula 97-102, 338

